

THE CLERGY REVIEW

Chairman of the Editorial Board :
Most Reverend Archbishop Downey

Editor :
Very Reverend Canon G. D. Smith, D.D., Ph.D.

The Editor is always ready to consider articles which may be of interest to the Clergy, but such articles should be typewritten, with double spacing. We also invite our readers to propose for solution cases in Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or other departments of sacred science, and we hope that they will not hesitate to contribute to our Correspondence pages their views on the solution of such cases or on any other matter which falls within the scope of THE CLERGY REVIEW.

Matter offered for publication may be sent direct, to save time, to the Editor at St. Edmund's College, Old Hall, Ware, Herts.

Other correspondence should be sent to the Manager,

THE CLERGY REVIEW
BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE LTD.
43-45 NEWGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.1

Subscription Rates for twelve monthly numbers :

£1 OR FIVE DOLLARS POST FREE
SINGLE NUMBERS TWO SHILLINGS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

JANUARY 1940

ARTICLES

	PAGE
(1) Gregory XVI and the Poles	1
By Rev. Andrew Beck, A.A., B.A.	
(2) The Highlands of Mass	13
By Rev. C. C. Martindale, S.J.	
(3) A Hierarchy that Fought	25
By Rev. Philip Hughes, L.S.H.	

HOMILETICS

The Sundays of February	40
By Very Rev. Francis Prime, C.S.S.R.	

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

(1) Ascetical and Mystical Theology	53
By Rev. Laurence P. Emery	
(2) Philosophy	58
By Rev. R. P. Phillips, D.D., M.A.	

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(1) Eucharistic Fast	65
(2) Audito Capitulo, Parocho, etc.	67
(3) Division of a Parish	69
(4) Kalendar for Certain Religious	70
(5) Duplicating	71
(6) Requiem Masses	73
(7) Missionary Quasi-Parochus	74
By Very Rev. Canon E. J. Mahoney, D.D.	

ROMAN DOCUMENTS	75
CHURCH MANAGEMENT	82
BOOK REVIEWS	84
CORRESPONDENCE	92

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XVIII, No. 1. JANUARY, 1940

GREGORY XVI AND THE POLES

PAGE
1
13
25
40
53
58
65
67
69
70
71
73
74
75
82
84
92

WITH the last partition of Poland, in 1795, a great Catholic nation was removed from the map of Europe, and its people shared out among the governments of Russia, Prussia, and Austria. The great majority of the Polish population fell under the despotic authority of the Empress Catherine the Great, whose policy was to destroy among them every vestige of their Catholicism and their nationality. She forbade all communication with the Holy See, brought the religious orders under the direct supervision of the ordinaries, created new bishoprics which she filled with her own creatures, and founded in her capital a "Roman Catholic Ecclesiastical College" modelled on the lines of the schismatic Holy Governing Synod, with the purpose of exercising through this body complete control of the hierarchy, making the bishops mere puppets of the State. Catherine died in 1796, before her plan had had time to bear fruit, and her immediate successors, the Emperors Paul (1796-1801) and Alexander I (1801-1825), were on the whole favourable to religion, there being some evidence to show that the latter even died a Catholic. Under Nicholas I (1825-1855), however, persecution broke out again, and an attempt at governmental control of the Church was renewed. Nicholas determined to complete what Catherine had begun, and to produce a single supreme authority in religion and politics. He had among his subjects in Poland and Russia about 12,000,000 Catholics, of whom the vast majority were in Poland. Of these about 7,000,000 belonged to the Ruthenian or United Greek Church, which had returned from

schism in 1596, and the remainder to the Latin rite.¹ Alexander determined to destroy the Ruthenian Church and to force its members to enter the Orthodox Church, which was controlled from St. Petersburg and had most of the characteristics of a State department. Later on, the Latin Catholics were also to be attacked and, if possible, deprived of their independence in the Imperial dominions.

The attack began in 1826 with the prohibition of the sale of all Uniat missals and service books. In 1828 a Greek Uniat College was founded to act as a governing body over the Uniat Church in Poland. By means of this assembly, entirely under the thumb of the government, the most vexatious regulations were imposed. The control and supervision of ecclesiastical education was taken out of the hands of the bishops and superiors of the religious orders, the training of the clergy was perverted in the interests of the schism, and the seeds of later defections were cunningly sown. The religious orders were skilfully crippled through the severe conditions which were imposed on the reception of postulants; while the parish clergy were shaken by the practice of keeping episcopal sees vacant as long as possible. Bishops, too, were appointed who were favourable to the government's scheme, the saddest example being that of Joseph Siemaszko, who was made assessor to the Catholic College at St. Petersburg, was largely responsible for the whole plan of campaign, and later apostatized completely.

In 1830 the November rising broke out in Poland, a national resistance to the tyrannical government which Nicholas I, in spite of all his promises, had

¹ The success of the prolonged persecution in Poland may be judged from the fact that by 1876 the Uniat Church had officially ceased to exist with the apostasy of the Bishop of Chelm, while the number of Latin Catholics had fallen to about 3,140,000. At the same time the membership of the Orthodox Russian Church had increased to about 6,250,000. See Lescoeur: *L'Eglise Catholique en Pologne*, II, 313.

imposed on the country. For almost a year civil war continued, but by 8 September, 1831, the Russian armies had entered Warsaw and the revolt was suppressed. The Constitution was dissolved, Poland ceased even to be called a kingdom, and by the Organic Institution was declared a province of the Russian Empire. The Powers of Europe stood by, sympathetic on the whole to the rising, but not lifting a finger to help the Poles. In England the Friends of Poland and other societies tried to bring pressure to bear on the government, but Palmerston, who at an earlier stage had taken refuge behind the sanctity of treaties and had refused to suggest that Russia should be deprived of rights which the Congress of Vienna, in 1815, had granted to her, now did no more than issue a weak protest.

In Poland the clergy had been sympathetic to the rising, and there were one or two isolated cases where priests had even taken arms. In doing so they played into the government's hands, and with the suppression of the rising more savage measures of persecution were introduced. Deportations to Siberia and other remote regions of the empire became common, and the deportation of children, even today a familiar proceeding in the Russian technique of persecution, was carried out on a large scale.¹ Communication with Rome was completely severed, and the reception of Papal letters was forbidden. It was made a penal offence to reconcile a convert from schism. The children of mixed marriages were to be brought up in the schismatic Church. Parishes were suppressed entirely or deprived of their clergy, and the construction of new churches was rigorously forbidden. Vivid impressions of the persecutions are provided by two private letters written in 1832 :

¹ In the House of Commons, on 28 June, O'Connell declared that more than a hundred thousand children between the ages of six and ten had been transported from Poland to Russia since the beginning of the persecution.

It is also true that children have been torn from the bosoms of their parents and carried off to Russia. An unfortunate mother of three helpless children, who, after the death of their father, a clerk in a public office, had been educated in an orphan asylum, on having heard that all the children of that institution were being transported, ran to the bridge of Praga to rescue her own. She attempted to effect this by throwing herself on the wagon on which her children were sitting among other companions of their misfortune, sobbing and crying, but in vain : a fierce Cossack brutally inflicted on her several lashes with a knout, and the poor miserable mother fainted away. Awakened from her state of absence to her former agony, she ran through the streets with dishevelled hair, raising loud cries of despair. At last, to put an end to her lamentation, she was seized by the police, thrown into a dungeon, and her cries were silenced.

Again, from Warsaw, written on 8 August, 1832 :

At Luck, a town of Volhynia, twelve priests were deprived of their clerical character for having administered the sacraments to the patriots who were mortally wounded. Some of the younger priests were sent to the Russian regiments of the Caucasus as common soldiers. . . . Young men who are desirous of preparing themselves for the Church meet with almost insurmountable obstacles. . . . Klingewicz, Bishop of Wilna, is sent to Siberia for remonstrating against the General-governor Chrapowicki, who prohibited the celebration of Christ's resurrection solemnity according to the usual custom of Lithuania. In the event of any one of the Poles getting ill on his way towards Siberia, if a confessor is asked for, a Catholic priest is refused him, and a Greek is sent. A good number of Catholic priests were flogged to death for having advocated the cause of their country. The estates of the Church are confiscated, either to the profit of the crown or the Russian clergy : the same is done with the Catholic convents and monasteries, one part of which is appropriated to military stores and magazines. The Polish soldiers and recruits who are now incorporated with the Russian regiments, if they will have any religion at all, must become Greeks, the Russian army

having no Catholic chaplains. Exiles to Siberia cease also to be Catholics, there being likewise no Catholic parishes. In like manner, the Polish children which are now carried off to Russia will be educated in the Greek religion.¹

In Rome Gregory XVI was on the Papal throne, and he was faced with the well-nigh impossible task of passing judgement, without sufficient information, on the events which had taken place in Poland. On the one hand an ancient Catholic kingdom with a magnificent record of heroic service in the cause of the Church was demanding its rights and its freedom. On the other hand the revolutionary spirit in Europe was bitterly opposed to the Church, and there were many indications that the Polish rising had been instigated in large measure by the secret societies. In April 1832, Prince Gagarin, the Russian minister in Rome, presented a note to the Holy See complaining of the action of the bishops and clergy in the recent revolution. The note declared that the influence of religion was necessary for the sake of peace, and indicated that "nothing would be more welcome than to see the Polish clergy employ its influence in the true meaning of its holy ministry, a ministry entirely of peace, submission, and reconciliation".

Unfortunately [went on the note], this has been far from the case in the recent disasters which have afflicted Poland : ecclesiastics of all classes, forgetting the holiness of their mission, have been mixed up in the most bloody acts, have almost always been the leaders of the revolutionary plots, while the fury of their fanaticism has carried them even to the battlefield, where they have been both actors and victims.

The accusation was grossly exaggerated, but on the strength of it the Russian Government went on to demand that the Holy Father should

use the voice of his spiritual authority to urge the Polish clergy to repent of such culpable and tragic errors,

¹ Quoted in *Polonia*, September 1832 and December 1832.

and to declare that they can only make reparation by entire submission to the law, and by frank co-operation in all that can guarantee the most real and sincere obedience to the legitimate order of things.

To this request was added the threat that, unless the Pope acted in the way suggested, all the Catholic bishops in Poland would be exiled to Siberia. Gregory hesitated for a long time before a decision of the greatest difficulty ; and finally, with the insurrection completely suppressed, nine months after the fall of Warsaw, on 9 June, 1832, addressed an encyclical letter to the Polish clergy. The letter, at first sight, appeared to answer the Russian Government's demands, and condemn the rising ; but in fact it was a carefully worded document which refrained from condemning the Polish clergy, though it recalled the Church's principles of submission to the lawful power, based on the Epistle to the Romans and the First of St. Peter. Rising against the lawful sovereign is the work of wicked men ; and it is the clergy's duty to watch "that artful men, propagators of false doctrines, may not scatter among your flock the seeds of lying and fatal doctrine".

In mentioning these principles recorded in Tradition [continued the Pope], we do not suppose, Venerable Brethren, that they are unknown to you, nor do we feel that you will be wanting in zeal to advocate and to propagate the doctrine of the submission which the subjects owe to the lawful sovereign ; but we wish that this our Brief may serve you as a proof of the sentiments with which we are filled towards you, and of our ardent wish that all the ecclesiastics of the kingdom may be distinguished by a purity of doctrine, by prudent conduct, and by pious lives : that they may be blameless in the sight of all men. In this manner we hope that affairs will be restored to order for the general good. Your magnanimous Emperor will show you his clemency, and listen to our representations and

requests, to the manifest advantage of the Catholic religion in the kingdom, which he promised at all times to protect.

With the letter Gregory sent a Memorandum to the Russian Ambassador, enumerating the hardships under which the Church was labouring in Russia, and demanding the removal of these unlawful restrictions on religion. Especially he requested that the control of clerical education should be taken out of the hands of the government commissioners, many of whom were not even Catholics, and should be left in the care of the bishops ; that free communication should be permitted between Polish Catholics and the Holy See, and that a Nuncio should be allowed at St. Petersburg.

The Memorandum was blandly ignored by the government, while the Brief, which was just what the Tsar wanted, was, unlike any other Papal document, widely circulated in Russia and Poland. The government interpreted it as a condemnation of the November rising and of the part played by the Polish clergy, and began to use it as a lever to enforce obedience even to their stringent penal laws against the Church. The Brief, thus interpreted, made a most painful impression on the Polish people, who were persuaded that they had been deserted by their Father in God. Liberals all over Europe were quick to blame the Pope, and in England *Polonia*, the journal published by the Literary Association of the friends of Poland, bitterly attacked the Bull, accusing the Pope of dereliction of his most sacred duty "for what he considers the interest of all despotic, and of his own temporary [*sic*] power".

In September 1832 Gregory renewed his demands to the Russian Government in a second letter, to which, this time, an answer was given. It was an answer remarkable for its evasion of the main points at issue, and for its cool denial that any religious

persecution was taking place in Poland. The questions of a Nuncio and of the deportation of children were ignored entirely, while with regard to the suppression of convents it was admitted that four had been demolished in Brest-Litovsk in 1830 to make room for new fortifications in the town, but that the religious had been fully compensated ; while six others had been suppressed in 1831 for having taken part in the rising. The fact that more than two hundred Latin convents out of a total of four hundred and twelve¹ had been closed as early as February 1832 was not mentioned. The government denied explicitly that it interfered with the free communication of Catholics with the Holy See, and with regard to the bishops merely declared that it was the duty of the civil government to decide the different spheres of jurisdiction and to determine the limits of conflicting powers within the Empire.

Meanwhile the Pope had been able to explain himself more fully to the Poles. Some months after the publication of the encyclical, a distinguished Polish layman, General Ladislas Zamoyski, came to Rome and had an audience of the Holy Father. He explained the perplexity and sorrow of his fellow-countrymen, and was also the bearer of a letter from Mgr. Gulkowski, Bishop of Podlachia, complaining that the authorities continually held over his head the Papal letter, and declared that any resistance to the civil government would incur the blame of the Pope. Gregory replied with an explanation of his own terrible position. "What can I do with a government which approaches me with the threat that it will avenge itself on my children in Poland unless I urge them to submission ?" He explained that he had not condemned the Poles, but that the refusal of the government to allow them to have direct communica-

¹ Lescoeur : *L'Eglise Catholique en Pologne*, I, 219.

tion with him had made it impossible for him to explain his exact meaning. The Polish general offered to carry a letter from the Pope to his bishop, an offer which Gregory accepted. In a further audience he came back to the difficulty of the problem, and the true meaning of the encyclical.

I shuddered at the persecutions which would break out on you, and be far worse than those which you had endured. I was told that all the Bishops in Poland would be deported to Siberia if I did not urge them to submit. I wondered what would happen to your unfortunate nation, deprived of its pastors, and so far away from me that for a long time its voice had not been able to reach me. I thought in my conscience, in face of such dangers, I could and should address some words of resignation to the bishops, and recall the Apostle's words that the duty of a Christian is to obey the established power ; but I did not hesitate to add that in no case is it permitted to that power to command what is contrary to the laws of God and the Church. . . . If I have to reproach you with not always informing me fully about yourselves, I have also perhaps the right to reproach you with having read me with too little attention, and with having failed to see, in the delay I took in writing, evidence of the constraint under which I was placed.¹

Meanwhile the persecution had not slackened. In 1834 the transportation of children to Minsk continued unchecked ; and in 1837 the Latin clergy in Poland were formally forbidden to administer the sacraments to people unknown to them—in other words to the Uniat Catholics, who were being remorselessly deprived of their own clergy. By 1839 the government considered that its work with regard to the Uniates was done, and passed an Act of Union by which the Uniat Church in Poland was suppressed and absorbed in the Russian National Church. The Tsar ordered a medal to be struck to commemorate

¹ The Pope's words were reported by Zamoyski, and are reproduced in Lescoeur, *op. cit.* pp. 211-215.

the event. With matchless effrontery it bore the inscription : "*Separated by violence in 1596, united by love in 1839.*"

Since the Russian Government denied that there was any persecution, and maintained that the destruction of the Uniat Church was merely a happy reunion of two bodies which had been artificially separated since the sixteenth century, the Pope decided that the cause of justice and truth demanded the publication of the facts to the world. Before the Sacred College, at a secret Consistory in July 1842, he pronounced an allocution in which he showed what he had done to protect his flock in Poland, and denounced the savage persecution carried on by the Russian Government.

What we have done unsparingly [he declared] to protect and defend the rights of the Church, in all the regions submitted to Russia, the public has never been told ; especially in those very regions it has never been published ; so that, to add to our sorrow, among the faithful who dwell there the enemies of the Church have, with their hereditary cunning, spread the story that, forgetful of our sacred duty, we have drawn a veil of silence over the evils which afflict them, and that we have almost abandoned the cause of the Catholic religion. . . . Such being the case, we owe it to God and to religion to cast from us the suspicion of such a shameful fault.

The Pope then handed to the Cardinals, and ordered to be published, a long Memorandum detailing his own efforts, and all the measures of persecution taken by the Russian Government. It enumerates in over thirty closely printed pages the obstacles placed in the way of the Holy See, the long series of Imperial Ukases progressively strangling the independence of the Church, and the impossible position created by the Imperial nomination of bishops.¹

¹ The principal measures taken against the Church enumerated in the memorandum are : communication of Catholics with the Holy See made a capital offence ; refusal of the Imperial government to admit a Nuncio

The allocution did something to check the persecution, but brought little alleviation to the sufferings of the Poles, until Nicholas himself paid a visit to Rome in December 1845. An audience was arranged with the Pope, the Tsar being accompanied by his minister at Rome, M. Bouteneff, and the Pope by the Englishman Cardinal Charles Acton. What actually took place at the audience has never been published, but Wiseman, in his memoirs, gives in his own ornate style a vivid picture of the Emperor's withdrawal from the audience. The page is worth quoting :

An English gentleman was in some part of the palace through which the Imperial visitor passed, as he returned from his interview, and described his altered appearance. He had entered with his usual firm and royal aspect, grand as it was, with statue-like features, stately form and martial bearing ; free and at ease, with gracious looks and condescending gestures of salutation. So he passed through the long suite of ante-rooms, the Imperial eagle, glossy, fiery, "with plumes unruffled, and with eye unquenched", in all the glory of pinions which no flight had ever weakened, of beak and talon which no prey had yet resisted. He came forth again, with head uncovered, and hair, if it can be said

or other representative of the Holy See ; episcopal control of religious orders ; suppression of the Uniat See of Luck (April 1828 ; i.e. long before the November rising) ; confiscation of property of religious orders ; closing of Catholic churches, and their transfer to the Russian rite ; deportation of Catholic children from "thousands of Polish families" ; transfer to the Russian Church of the sanctuary of Our Lady of Poczayow, and of the Basilian monasteries in Volhynia and Lithuania ; similar transfer of the Carthusian monastery at Bercza ; confiscation of 17 churches in the Latin diocese of Luck, and of a much larger number in the Uniat diocese ; similar expropriations in the diocese of Kaminitz ; in the Polish provinces suppression of 212 Latin religious houses out of 291 ; complete suppression of parishes where there were less than 400 Catholics ; prohibition to Latin clergy to hear Uniat confessions or to give them Holy Communion ; prohibition to baptize children of mixed marriages, or to reconcile any person who has taken part, even once, in the Greek rite ; prohibition to build new Catholic churches ; prohibition to use the name "Uniat Greek Church" ; nullity of marriage contracted before only the Catholic priest ; confiscation of all property of converts to Catholicism ; various nominations of bishops without reference to the Holy See.

The complete text of the Allocution, with all the pertinent documents, is in A. Theiner : *Vicissitudes de l'Eglise Catholique en Pologne et en Russie*, Paris, 1843, Tome II, pp. 209-513.

of man, dishevelled ; haggard and pale ; looking as though in an hour he had passed through the condensation of a protracted fever ; taking long strides, with stooping shoulders, unobservant, unsaluting : he waited not for his carriage to come to the foot of the stairs, but rushed out into the outer court, and hurried away from apparently the scene of a discomfiture. It was the eagle dragged from his eyrie among the clefts of the rocks, "from his nest among the stars", his feathers crumpled, and his eye quelled, by a power till then despised.¹

Gregory himself refused to discuss the audience, merely remarking : "I said to him what the Holy Ghost dictated to me." The effect of his words was soon apparent, however, and negotiations were opened for the purpose of drawing up a Concordat, which was eventually signed in July 1847. An archdiocese and six dioceses were canonically erected for the Polish provinces in Russia. For the Kingdom of Poland itself the eight dioceses established by Pope Pius VII in 1818 were restored, and the rights of the bishops to superintend the education of their clergy were defined. The Concordat was a victory for the Papacy, though the later action of the Russian Government made it of short duration. Pope Gregory, however, had not lived to see the reward of his labours and sufferings. He had died early in June 1846, just over a year before the Concordat was signed.

ANDREW BECK, A.A.

¹ Wiseman : *Recollections of the Last Four Popes*, 1859 ed., p. 324.

THE HIGHLANDS OF MASS

OUR title is not meant to be just fantastic or even fanciful : it corresponds to this—We have found that many Catholics regard the Consecration as a sort of peak ; a topmost point in Mass : everything before it urges them to climb up to it, and what happens afterwards is correspondingly “down-hill”, getting towards the end, especially if they are not going to Communion.

But then, they feel that this cannot be true : they know that Our Lord is present on the Altar from Consecration to Communion in a sense in which at other times He is not. But then, instead of having reached a peak, they feel as if they had come to a sort of lofty *plateau*, a kind of Table Mountain, and they experience a lack of orientation there, even though they use their Missal, and we might almost say especially if they do. For the Missal may well disconcert them.

First, so much is done after the Consecration which “balances” what was done before it, though surely, they feel, what happens after it ought to be unique. Yet here is a list of Saints after the Consecration just as there was before—and, in a sense, of not such important Saints as Our Lady and the Apostles were. And just as the pre-Consecration Saints were themselves preceded by the Memento for the Living, so are the post-Consecration Saints followed by the Memento for the Dead. They observe then how mechanically “balanced” are two masses of Prayer which are, really, different in kind. Besides, though they recognize that the Holy Souls are in quite a special situation, they may think that those Sufferers receive a rather exorbitant privilege by dint of being remembered when people are very likely praying “harder”, as presumably they do after the Consecration, and when our Lord is actually

present sacrificially. And the Living are after all still in peril, whereas the Holy Souls are not.

Almost more embarrassingly, expressions are used both before and after the Consecration which seem practically equivalents. Before it, with the utmost humility we ask God "to accept and bless these gifts, these offerings, this holy flawless sacrifice", and similar expressions are used in the little prayer *Quam oblationem* : but then, after the Consecration, we ask all over again that our pure, holy and stainless victim may be accepted by God, and even, seem to remind Him, as a sort of inducement, that He accepted the gifts of Abel, the sacrifice of Abraham, and the holy and stainless victim offered by Melchisedech. But, they feel, who would beseech a man to accept a million, on the grounds that he once accepted sixpence ?

This undoubtedly leads up to a sort of break, the *Pater*, and the Faithful easily see that it is right that during the most solemn time of all we should pray in Our Lord's own words which He taught us ; but after that, the Prayers seem to follow in no particular order up to the Communion, and then the Mass ends with a rush. We well remember going to Sung Masses before we were Catholic, and being bewildered by what seemed to us a very long-drawn preparation, and an incredibly rapid termination.

We might have been inclined to think that this was a mere personal sentiment, were it not that we knew others to whom the Canon of the Mass presented some kind of practical difficulty. We seldom, when speaking to them, try to explain what dislocations the Roman Canon may historically have suffered, and we certainly do not propose to do so in this paper, which is meant, please God, to be of devotional service if possible. We want to suggest some very simple considerations as to how the Faithful may behave and even enjoy themselves on that kind of

mountain-ledge where they rest between the Sanctus and the Consecration (though not much need be said about that), and then, between the Consecration (which is *not* the topmost peak) and the Pater and again the Communion. After the Communion, the Liturgy really does seem to suggest that you should be left to yourself for a space ; and Pius X and his successors undoubtedly desire that each should make a definitely personal Thanksgiving.

The ledge, in any case, is manageable. People feel that the Sanctus admits them, vaguely, to a specially sacred part of the Mass ; but after all, the great moment has not yet arrived ; they are still substantially where they were before. So there is no great difficulty in getting them to pray for the Pope and for their Bishop, which is a good thing in itself, and not likely to be done any too often at other times, especially as "prayers for the Pope's intentions" tend to become so very technical. Too often the Pope is not thought of explicitly, let alone his "intentions", which is not fatal, but all the same a pity. It is of course easy to persuade them to pray for relatives and friends. We may perhaps hope that during the Preface they may have really been giving thanks, and justifying the name of the "Eucharistic" Sacrifice. Yet, save for "favours received" (a candle to St. Anthony !), I do not know that gratitude is our strong point. St. Paul's overwhelming gratitude for having been chosen, called, redeemed and rescued, predestined to glory ! Do we experience gratitude for these tremendous general favours ? Some of the devout do indeed tend to preen themselves on being Catholics ; but there is sometimes a stuck-up snobbishness about that, and a thanking God that they are not as other men are, and they are not slow in letting the other men feel it. That is not what we mean by gratitude ; and, where gratitude in the Eucharistic sense exists, we should not at all mind if it persisted

throughout the space between Sanctus and Consecration and even overbrimmed into what follows. Still, it is good to join with the Church in praying for the Living, and also, to unite oneself with the Saints now commemorated, who do not indeed need to be prayed for, but who are certainly alive.

The Consecration arrives : heads bow ; the bell rings ; the maximum seems to have happened. Yet it has not—save in the sense that it is a long-drawn maximum. We have entered upon a *space* of sacrifice. It is true that we are within an area of our mountain which is fenced off from all that lies below it : but even this space contains differentiations ; in a line—it makes it easier for people to pray if it be seen that each paragraph of the Missal has here a separate value and significance. Above all, during it we are to *remember*, and to *offer*. We must live both in the past, and the present.

“*And so, Lord . . . mindful of Thy Son’s so blessed Passion, but also of His Resurrection from the depths, yes, and of His glorious Ascension into Heaven*” . . . we offer to Thee . . .

The significant past is thus rapidly commemorated and carried on till it becomes outside of time—the Resurrection and Ascension and Glorification are *now* ; He who died on Calvary is alive and here, and Him, His living self, do we re-present to the divine Majesty. Unfortunately, the very word Sacrifice has taken on a new meaning in our language, owing to the Protestant abolition of Mass, which was the only thing that kept alive the old true meaning.¹ Sacrifice

¹ It is significant that the idea of a purely spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, for which the abolition of the “materialistic” Mass was to make room, has itself disappeared from modern instinct. It was in fact Mass that safeguarded it, just as the dethronement of Mary, Saints, relics, images and what not, perpetrated that Christ might reign alone, has left Him in His turn without any place in the contemporary ordering of life. So vitally are all parts of the Faith interconnected.

meant a gift given to God (which of itself made it different from any other gift given to anyone else) and by Him accepted. Now it has discarded any connection with God and means going without something you would like to keep. "I resolved to send my son to a good school, and so I sacrificed my car. I have made many other sacrifices for him!"

We are invited, then, to appropriate the first post-Consecrational paragraph in the Missal to the notion of pure Sacrificial Worship—the giving to God what He deserves, and, in this one and only case, *all* that He "deserves"—the adequate gift, Christ; and the gift which, being Christ, He cannot but accept. Thus, even though the mind be not here directed towards self at all, intense satisfaction may be really though almost unconsciously felt simply for God's sake: He is receiving and accepting That which alone is adequate; He is being purely worshipped and is "well-pleased". At this point, do not let us even for a moment reflect that this is happening also through *our* co-operation! Self can be kept till later.

But we soon are invited to turn our minds back at least a little way towards self, because in the second paragraph we allude to Abraham as "our" Patriarch, even though Abel is "Thy" servant, and Melchisedech "Thy" High-Priest. We ventured once to suggest that no average Catholic, if invited to write a Canon for Mass without previous "briefing", would nowadays be likely to mention those three names. We do not now feel very strongly about Abraham, I fear, let alone Abel. We were told that any Catholic with the slightest liturgical sense would of course write down practically what we now read. So be it. It only proves, alas, how few of us have the liturgical sense, for I am ready to wager that only on this occasion do our thoughts stray off towards Cain's victim; I doubt if it will evoke much response when we hear it invoked (if we do) in the prayers for

the dying. However, in this paragraph we are still forgetful of self as self-in-isolation : we are incorporating ourselves with all other Offerers throughout history, and we choose three symbolic names to represent them—that of Abel, of whom first we are told, in all history, that he offered an acceptable gift to God : we can regard him then as standing at the very head of the tremendous tale of Sacrifice : then, that of Abraham, who stands at the head of the whole Chosen People, of the Jewish Church, and of the Catholic Church itself inasmuch as God's revelation has been continuous, and the Scriptures never make any absolute separation between the old and the new Israel : and finally, the mysterious figure of Melchisedech.

Mysterious ? For must not Melchisedech have been technically a pagan ? "The Most High God" (if that is a fitting translation) was by no means a title confined to the worship of the One True God. And in any case, at that time there were no official worshippers of the true God save within the family of Abraham. There alone did the guaranteed revelation subsist. We can indeed expect that the original Revelation percolated down in some sense throughout the human race : but we do not any more seek for symptoms of this quite as we did : I mean, we do not look for *disiecta membra* of dogmas surviving, in however mutilated a condition, in pagan cults ; and even if we found them, it would be in *pagan* cults that they were found. Melchisedech must therefore have been technically a pagan, and yet, sufficiently pleasing to God not only to be made much of by St. Paul, but to find his way into the most sacred part of the Canon. It would seem, then, that Melchisedech can stand as representative actually of the pagan world, in so far as it was to some extent pleasing to God and not utterly reprobate ; and indeed, I would feel myself more in sympathy with a pagan who so

believed in God as to want to offer sacrifice to Him, than with a modern man in whom belief in God had so weakened that the whole idea of sacrifice had become meaningless to him, and out of whom the very instinct for pure worship had died.

Not forgetting, then, the limitations imposed by our belief in supernatural revelation, we can put ourselves "in one", at this point of Mass, with the whole of the human race in so far as it unites in worshipping God through sacrifice, and there is joy in doing so actually before we begin to think of ourselves as individuals. We might just add that we do not quote those ancient sacrifices as a kind of proof that God does accept human gifts—so will He not accept ours? so much as a reminder that He did accept even that; how much more, then, may we trust that He will accept the transcendent gift that is ours now to offer: and if we proceed to argue: "But may we not take that for granted? He cannot refuse His own Son"—we recall that the Gift and primary Priest are indeed Christ, but that we with all our imperfections are included in that Gift and are co-operating with that Priest, and can but hope that our faults may as it were be swamped by what is so much greater even than our virtues. *Ne respicias peccata mea. . . . Non aestimator meriti. . . .*

The third paragraph definitely introduces a prayer for ourselves, and does not allude only to our God-ward offering. Again, we need not loiter over the much disputed expression "bid these gifts be carried by the hands of Thy holy Angel up to Thine altar on high": it is not difficult to regard it "dramatically", like the Offertory in Masses for the Dead, which vividly displays the Soul as still in danger and susceptible of escort by St. Michael. And we are, I suppose, presuming that if our share in "offering" be unacceptable, that part of the gift will not be able to reach God's throne by any strength of

ours. In any case, it is good to notice that the Priest prays in the plural, even now ; and his point is, that all we—all we who shall have fed from “this sharing in the Altar” may be filled with blessing—significantly, *not* “our sharing in *this* Altar” : we share in the world-Altar, the universal and eternal Sacrifice, however truly it be, here and now, applied to our souls.

Finally, the Priest turns from earth to the wider world hereafter ; to Purgatory and then Heaven. It is simple to think about the Souls in Purgatory, and also, maybe, about the Saints in general : but I presume that few can attend separately to each of the Saints mentioned during Mass, unless indeed they have studied them outside of Mass, so that stored-up impressions are as it were embalmed in each name. The name then evokes the cumulative impression without more ado. But even so, I take it that St. Chrysogonus, St. Matthias, St. Alexander are not likely to win much active response from those even who have read about them. But if we think of them as a *group*, and observe that we define them as “apostles and martyrs”, and that we proceed to ask to be admitted into their company, and recognize that it is improbable that we shall feel at home with them in heaven unless we have produced at least some sort of “family-likeness” to them while we were on earth, we shall see that this prayer is a weighty one, and ought to be prayed, if sincerely, with a real sense of responsibility. For it is no light thing to ask to be among apostles and martyrs also on earth !

We arrive, then, at what really *is* the “peak” of our mountainous Mass—that “Little Elevation” which seems to us the Great one ; for, it is wholly towards God, whereas the consecrational elevations are for the sake of the people, that they may “see God”, as our ancestors used to say : they thought the day wasted on which they had not “seen” Him. But

it is le
Christ
ever c
for T
to us
Sakra
to her
truly

It. C
He “
bring
bless
over
proc
com
Chri
Him
ther
and
mon

som
from
phe
we
sch
by
as
do

the
wi
re
em
th
C
in
d

it is led up to by that superb introduction : "Through Christ our Lord, through whom, O Lord, Thou dost ever create all these good things, dost set them aside for Thyself, dost give them life, dost bless them, and to us dost give them." Other gifts than the B. Sacrament may indeed have been originally referred to here ; but now it is the Blessed Sacrament, however truly other good gifts may be reckoned in along with It. God makes the very elements of which it consists : He "sanctifies" and separates them for Himself : He brings them to life and enriches them with His blessing like a fertile field : and then, to us He hands over the whole of His great Mystery ; and so we proclaim that through, by means of, Christ—and in company with Christ—and in the very person of Christ who picks us up and incorporates us with Himself, there is to Thee—not "may there be"—but there is actually accruing to Thee, O God, *all* honour and glory. Impossible to reach higher, to embrace more.

The soul draws breath, or, if you will, descends somewhat, as Christ did when on His own mountain, from this rarefied air into the quiet familiar atmosphere of the Our Father. We modestly affirm that we have no adequate words of our own, but have been schooled by the Saviour's lessoning, set on right lines by His divine guidance, and so have courage to speak as follows—Our Father. But from then on, undoubtedly the Liturgy looks forward to Communion.

It picks up the last words of the *Pater* and amplifies them in a splendid all-inclusive prayer which ends with a petition for that Peace which must be the result of a Communion made in Charity ; and then enacts what is meant by Communion, by breaking the Sacred Host and placing a fragment in the Chalice. This most meaningful act, unfortunately invisible to the Faithful, enshrines, we learn, a double memory. The Pope used to send from his

Altar particles of what he had consecrated to the regional clergy of Rome. Further, he had reserved a fragment from the previous day's Mass and inserted it into the Chalice of today's ; and again reserved a fragment from today's Mass for the Chalice of tomorrow's. Thus it was visible that there was but one Mass, in reality, throughout all the world and in all ages and that all went to Communion in the Selfsame. The "Pax Domini sit semper vobiscum" is substituted for the normal Dominus vobiscum ; the Agnus follows and the Prayer "Domine Iesu Christe, qui dixisti : Pacem", etc., follow and it is they which form a "unit", not the three prayers which immediately precede the Communion.

We recite therefore the Agnus, not haphazard, or because it occurs just then, we know not why, but because its prayer for mercy aims definitely at curing our pitiful condition of disunion, ill-will, and hostility among ourselves—individuals, classes, nationalities, races. It is quite terrible if a priest allows any of these animosities to survive in his soul, and God forbid that he should foster any of them. We are writing this on what may be the eve of war. During the last war, words of hate, angering words, were to be found even upon the lips of us priests : at Lourdes itself, we are told, a memorial was to be put up which would have made it almost impossible for a German to visit the shrine and not to be vitally injured in spirit. This was prevented. It remains that all these prayers between the Pater and the actual Communion are bound together by the notions of Charity, Unity and Peace, virtues which manifestly are fostered by a true Communion, while their opposite vices make any true Communion impossible. Hence if the "Our Father" was in a sense the upshot of all that had preceded it, so does it introduce us into all that follows it. Nor need we insist that "peace" does not mean merely the absence of a war that is fought

with guns : it implies a state in which we can display the maximum of orderly Christian activity. This cannot be displayed where there is no union, and there can be no union where there is no charity ; and there can be no charity where there is no justice ; so we have, even in "peace time" to seek positively to eliminate those social injustices which too often, in opposition to the great Encyclicals, we are inclined to leave to others as affairs of "natural" well-being only.

It is clear that the "method" we have suggested would be of no service to those who can be so absorbed in the idea of sacrifice that they worship God sacrificially throughout Mass without needing to attend to words at all ; nor again to those who prefer to make use of other aids, such as the rosary, as you may see Irish or Polish peasants doing. Still, during Mass, at any rate, when we priests are offering it, we are bidden use a form of words, and if we do not explicitly attend to each, that should be because we are doing something still better. But if we do try to attend, and find that certain tracts of Mass seem undifferentiated and not, so to say, to our taste, the above paragraphs may be, please God, of help.

We conclude with a personal reminiscence. We mentioned that we had been to Mass before we were Catholics, out of curiosity. We liked it : we enjoyed the "blessed mutter of the Mass" going on in our neighbourhood. But during our instruction, we were told little if anything about Sacrifice, and nothing about the Missal. So we had to do our best by ourselves. We easily liked the Collects, the Gospels and the Offertory prayers ; and what followed the Pater, and also the Prefaces, appealed to us. But we gave up the Epistles as hopeless ; and much of the Canon remained unintelligible. We simply did not want to pray about Abel ; and the many requests that God would accept our sacrifice, and also the request that "*nobis* haec oblatio fiat Corpus et Sanguis", made us

slightly uneasy, lest after all the early Liturgy had meant that the Real Presence depended on the dispositions of the worshipper, which we knew to be wrong. Yet the Missal did appeal to us, in patches : and we feel sure that there must be many semi-educated people like ourselves, who want to "find their way about Mass", and even when they understand its structure, would like to appreciate more intimately the "difficult" parts of its Canon, and also, who want to avoid any routine or insincerity in their prayers. For such as these, maybe, what we have suggested, especially about the three paragraphs following the Consecration, might be of service.

C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J.

A HIERARCHY THAT FOUGHT—1554-1559

SOME years ago the editors of THE CLERGY REVIEW paid me the compliment of an invitation to write a paper for the first number of this magazine. I cast round for a subject and presently put together a kind of study of the bishops who, in the Convocation of 1531, by their qualified acknowledgement of the Royal Supremacy, began the great work of de-Catholicizing the *Ecclesia Anglicana*. The paper was called *A Hierarchy that Failed*. And now, on a further prompting from the Editor of the Review, I endeavour to set out some of the significant facts about a hierarchy that fought where its predecessor had failed to fight. My aim is to show, so far as a single magazine article can do this, how the bishops who resisted Elizabeth in 1559 differed from those who fell before her father in 1531. Substantially this is, very largely, a note on the work of Queen Mary and Cardinal Pole as the joint creators of a new type of English bishop.

When Queen Mary came to the throne, and to her chosen task of the Catholic restoration, three out of the twenty-six sees of the provinces of York and Canterbury were vacant, Rochester, Bangor and Durham, while one prelate—Hooper—was Bishop both of Worcester and of Gloucester.

There were, then, twenty-two bishops in possession of their sees. All of them were excommunicated, by reason of their adherence to Henry VIII in his schism and their own individual, explicit repudiation of the Pope's primacy. Only one of these twenty-two bishops was a survivor from the hierarchy of Catholic times, that is to say owed his original appointment to the Pope. This was Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury. The rest had been made bishops solely by the King as "Supreme Head after Christ of the Church of England", thirteen of them by Henry

VIII, in the years 1534-1545, and eight by Edward VI. A further complication was that the seven most recently appointed had been consecrated according to the rite provided in the new Book of Common Prayer. Twelve of the twenty-two had married, and six of these were bishops consecrated by the Catholic ritual. Four sees, in addition to the bishop in possession, had an ex-bishop also, the prelate whose deprivation had made room for the bishop actually in possession. The situation could hardly have been more complex for a queen anxious to restore the Catholic *status quo*.

The first action taken towards this curiously varied hierarchy was the legal dispossession of several of its members. The first to go were Ponet of Winchester and Ridley of London, the successors to two deprived prelates, Stephen Gardiner and Edmund Bonner, whose appeal against their deprivation as illegal was now heard—after a lapse of years—and upheld. Tunstal was at the same time restored to Durham, left vacant since his dispossession, and Veysey of Exeter replaced his own dispossessioner Miles Coverdale, while Day, in the same way, returned to Chichester in place of Scory.

In March 1554 Catholic discipline, in so far as Parliament had again given it legal existence, came once more into play, and commissions were issued for an inquiry into the conduct or status of seven other bishops. The result was the deprivation of Holgate of York, Bush of Bristol, Bird of Chester, and Ferrar of St. Davids on 13 March for marriage, and of Hooper of Gloucester, Taylor of Lincoln and Harley of Hereford for heresy on 15 March. Barlow of Bath and Wells had already "resigned", and Cranmer had, in law, forfeited his see on his condemnation for high treason in the previous December.

Mary had thus, by 16 March, 1554, to find bishops for nine sees, in addition to the two she found really

vacant at her accession. But before coming to the men chosen for these sees something had better perhaps be said of the bishops who were retained, the motley episcopal relics of Henry VIII's activity as Supreme Head. There were fifteen of them in all. In order of seniority they were :

John Veysey	Bishop of Exeter	since 1519
Cuthbert Tunstal	„ Durham	„ 1530
Stephen Gardiner	„ Winchester	„ 1531
These three were survivors of the old, papally appointed hierarchy of Catholic times. Then came twelve bishops of Henry VIII's own sole making :		
Thomas Goodrich	Bishop of Ely	since 1534
Robert Parfew	„ St. Asaph	„ 1536
Robert Aldrich	„ Carlisle	„ 1537
John Salcot	„ Salisbury	„ 1539
Edmund Bonner	„ London	„ 1540
Robert King	„ Oxford	„ 1545
John Chambers	„ Peterborough	„ 1541
George Day	„ Chichester	„ 1543
Nicholas Heath	„ Worcester	„ 1543
Robert Sampson	„ Coventry and Lichfield	„ 1543
Antony Kitchin	„ Llandaff	„ 1545
Thomas Thirlby	„ Norwich	„ 1550

Five of these twelve "Henrician" bishops were one-time abbots, who had peaceably surrendered their abbeys in return for comfortable pensions. King had been the head of Cistercian Oseney ; the rest were Benedictines : Parfew Abbot of Bermondsey ; Salcot of the great abbey of Hyde ; Chambers of Peterborough—the last abbot and the first bishop—Kitchin of Eynsham.¹

Three of these fifteen bishops were not destined to play any great part in the Marian restoration, for they died in the summer of 1554 before the famous

¹Six of the thirteen bishops removed in 1553-1554 were also ex-religious, so that in the hierarchy as Mary's accession found it ex-regulars held just half the places.

day of reconciliation came. These were Veysey, an old court prelate of Henry VIII's reign, and two of the typical Tudor diplomat bishops, Sampson and Goodrich. Sampson had been one of the select deputation sent to harry Mary into submission to her father, and Goodrich had been sufficiently sympathetic to heresy under the régime of Edward VI to be Lord High Chancellor, and to sign the proclamation of Lady Jane Grey's accession.

The five ex-monk bishops were none of them men of any great significance. King was a connection of Cromwell's, by the marriage of a brother, and this had helped him to become Abbot of Oseney in time to surrender the properties to the Crown. It was his good fortune to be able to surrender, at the same time, the abbey of Thame, of which also he was the head. King had been a bishop well-nigh thirty years in 1553, for it was in those last years of peace before "the blessed divorce" rose above the horizon that he had been consecrated, as auxiliary to John Longland, Bishop of Lincoln, King Henry's confessor. Bishop King had made no opposition to the abolition of the Mass in Edward VI's reign, for all that the bodies of so many of his priests, in the time of the great religious rising of 1549, dangled from their belfries *in signum fidei*. The history of his religious opinions is such that the latest writer to touch on it has been able to suggest that, at the very end, he went over to plain heresy, after all his reconciliations.

If Salcot, Bishop of Salisbury, graduated B.A. in 1488, he must, by the time of Mary's accession, sixty-five years later, have been a very old man indeed, and we do know that, for his age, he was dispensed from attendance at her coronation. He has the distinction that, after his petitioning Clement VII to grant Henry his divorce, that Pope refused to

¹ A suggestion that, *pace* the author, seems to me extremely unlikely, but cf. Garrett, *The Marian Exiles* (1938), *sub voce* King.

accept him as Bishop of Bangor, and so he was consecrated despite the Pope, the second English bishop to be consecrated by virtue of the Royal Supremacy. Of Salcot's share in the Catholic restoration we know nothing at all. And we must say the same of his fellow ex-Benedictine, Robert Parfew,¹ who, translated in 1554 from St. Asaph to Hereford, died just a fortnight before Capon in September 1557.

Chambers of Peterborough is described as "a safe and conformable person", and he owed his ecclesiastical success as much to his friendship with the rising house of Russell as to his timely surrender of his abbey to Henry VIII. Here again is a bishop of whose episcopate we know nothing, and about whom, from all that is known of his career, we might not ungenerously prophesy that he would, on Elizabeth's accession, do just what his fellow, Antony Kitchin, actually did and "turn once again". Chambers was perhaps seventy when the Legate reconciled him. Antony Kitchin was older still, if the generally accepted dates are true. He had been a monk of Westminster Abbey, and the head of the Benedictine College at Oxford. Henry VIII gave him a good pension when he surrendered his abbey, and promised him still better. The poor little Welsh see of Llandaff was all the "still better" that came, and that only when Kitchin was close on seventy.

This group of aged, ex-monastic nonentities among the bishops is balanced by an equal number of diplomats and legists. Tunstal, now in extreme old age, had of course been the intimate friend of Thomas More, and had enjoyed a really international fame as humanist, mathematician and legist. Gardiner and Bonner were legists too, and had laid the foundations of a prosperous episcopal career in wholehearted efforts on the King's behalf at the time of the famous divorce suit. Both had been of Wolsey's

¹ Or Warton.

household, and both had distinguished themselves by a personal violence of speech to the Pope. Clement VII had indeed been so far provoked, on one occasion, as to threaten Bonner with a hanging. All three of these bishops had managed to twist their consciences and to preach and write in defence of the Royal Supremacy. Pole had hardly been able to credit that Tunstal, whom he had admired for a lifetime, could have written what was published under his name. As to the past literary activities of Gardiner and Bonner, some heretic, now in Mary's reign—it was John Bale, ex-Carmelite friar and ex-(Edwardine) Bishop of Ossory—had had the happy thought to embarrass these repentant champions of Henry VIII by translating into English Gardiner's book—*De Vera Obedientia*—and Bonner's anti-papal preface to it. Inevitably the matter was urged against the bishops as now, in the heyday of the restoration, they presided over heresy trials, and with this advantage to us, that Bonner openly admitted that it was simple fear of the punishment for resistance that had won himself and Gardiner over to King Henry's way of thinking; the pendant to which story is Gardiner's own exclamation as, while he lay dying, his chaplain read to him the Passion of Our Lord from the Gospel. The priest came to the story of St. Peter's fall and the bishop broke out, "I denied like Peter, I went out like Peter, but as yet I have not wept like Peter." And Tunstal, in his will, makes an unmistakably similar reference, when he uses the liturgical absolution of the dead with a special addition all his own: "Enter not into judgement, I beseech Thee, with thy runaway servant, O just Judge."

These three bishops were very prominent personages in the new reign, and not unnaturally, seeing they were three of the most experienced, the most capable and the most disinterested of all the Crown's servants. Tunstal remained at his post in the north,

a ki
as
ad
the
of h
able
pres
L
in c
the
Can
repu
Cran
rise,
Chri
had
he s
time
A
age,
expe
life t
izing
a sa
willi
nam
down
depr
happ
was
in th
again
mole
still
Char
T
a leg
were
Vol

a kind of viceroy for the border counties. Gardiner, as Lord Chancellor, was the Queen's principal advisor and executive officer. Bonner, as head of the diocese which, of all others, was the special seat of heresy, gained a new publicity from the innumerable trials and condemnations at which he had to preside.

Heath and Thirlby were diplomatists also ; Thirlby in constant employment as an ambassador, even in the first months of Elizabeth's reign. Both were Cambridge men, and while Thirlby had then been reputed "a favourer of the gospel", and had had Cranmer's friendship to thank for his rapid early rise, Heath had been a fellow of one of the colleges—Christ's—in whose foundation St. John Fisher had had so great a share. But no more than Thirlby had he scrupled to follow the King when the testing time came.

All this group—save Tunstal—were much of an age, men in the middle fifties, with twenty-five years experience of court and council and parliamentary life to guide their present action. To the protestantizing of religion in the late reign they had all offered a satisfactory resistance. Heath had indeed been willing to use the new Ordinal, though not to put his name to it. But when the order went out to take down the altars he refused, and was thereupon deprived of his see and imprisoned, as had already happened to Gardiner and to Bonner. Tunstal, too, was imprisoned and deprived, but Thirlby, although in the debates on the Prayer Book he made a stand against the new heretical doctrines, was left unmolested, and the end of Edward's reign found him still in confidential employment as ambassador to Charles V.

The two remaining bishops of this group that was a legacy to the restoration from the previous régime were Robert Aldrich of Carlisle and George Day of

Chichester. Their early careers had been scholarly rather than political. Aldrich had, in his Cambridge days, been a pupil of Erasmus, and one of the great man's companions in the celebrated pilgrimage he made to Walsingham. From King's he had passed to be a master at Eton and then, after some years, to a prosperous university career. He did useful service for the King in the divorce campaign, and a Windsor canonry, with its *sequelae* of the Provostship of Eton and an appointment as almoner to Queen Jane Seymour, were his reward. One of his memories of that time, which the news of Queen Mary's restoration of the Sheen Charterhouse might now stir to life, was of his visit to the London Carthusians in 1535 to persuade them to accept the Royal Supremacy. As Bishop of Carlisle, he did his best to fight the liturgical changes in Edward VI's reign, and he distinguished himself as a writer against the sacramental heresies.

George Day had been a still more active figure, for he was a theologian by profession, as one might say. In his early life he had been one of St. John Fisher's chaplains, and Master of the saint's own foundation at Cambridge, St. John's College. He had been public orator, and in that office had, no doubt, laid the foundations of his later fame as a preacher, "the floridest preacher" of his time, who in the eventful year 1553 preached both at King Edward's funeral and at Queen Mary's coronation. In all the movement to rearrange creeds and services that filled the last years of Henry VIII's reign and all the reign of his son, Day had had an important share, even before his appointment to Chichester—at the early age of 42. He was a member of most of the various commissions, and when the sacramental heretics were able to show their hand openly after the death of King Henry, Day stood firmly by the old beliefs. He voted against the Act of Uniformity and refused

to put his name to the Prayer Book, and finally, for his active resistance to the protestantizers—his refusal, for example, to take down the altars in his diocese—he was deprived of his see and imprisoned.

Day did not live to see the end of the restoration. He died in 1556, in a fatal twelvemonth that saw the deaths of no fewer than six of these bishops. Aldrich, too, was among these, and the rest were four of the one-time abbots. Of the five pre-Marian Catholic bishops who survived to meet the changes of 1559, all were of the diplomatic group save one, and it was he, the ex-abbot, who, this time, alone of the hierarchy failed. Tunstal, Bonner, Heath and Thirlby, in 1559, stood true. For these also the Marian restoration had not been in vain.

So much for the prelates whom the Marian restoration under the Cardinal Legate received as a legacy from the régime of the Royal Supremacy. What of the bishops who were the product of the restoration? Between 1554 and 1558 nineteen¹ bishops were appointed for the different English sees, and as a body they offer many contrasts, in comparison with their colleagues of the earlier régime. Seven of these consecrations were of bishops to replace those deprived for heresy or for marriage. The other twelve were of bishops to fill vacancies caused by death or by translation of the previous bishop.

One of these new bishops, Holyman of Bristol, was a Benedictine, a one-time monk of the abbey of Reading in the time of the martyr abbot, Blessed Hugh Faringden. Hopton, of Norwich, was a Dominican, and Goldwell, of St. Asaph, a Theatine. The rest were of the secular clergy.

They were most of them men in the very prime of life. Pole was fifty-six when he was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury, in succession to Cranmer

¹ Including Cardinal Pole.

(22 March, 1556), and only five of the other eighteen new bishops were any older. Eight of them indeed were only in the early forties. And yet few of them were long-lived, for eight of the nineteen died before the year of crisis, 1559, and another four in the twelvemonth following. Indeed this curiously general inability of Pole's bishops to last, was to prove one of the contributing causes to the ease of the Protestant victory in the parliamentary struggle of 1559.

No single one of these nineteen new bishops had received his see as a reward for services to the Crown in any secular capacity. There was not among them any who, like Tunstal, Gardiner or Bonner, was primarily a lawyer and a diplomatist by profession. The breach here with a tradition more than a century old is very striking.

Four¹ of the new bishops had spent much of their life since the schism beyond the seas, exiles for the faith. Ralph Baynes, now appointed to Coventry and Lichfield, had made a name for himself at Cambridge as a vigorous opponent of Latimer. He had then gone abroad and won great distinction as a Hebrew scholar, and was indeed Professor of Hebrew at the University of Paris. He has an honoured place in the history of scholarship as one of the pioneers of Hebrew learning in England. Christopherson, the youngest of the bishops, was also a humanist of repute, one of the leaders in the revival of Greek learning at Cambridge. He was of a later generation than Baynes, and apparently born too late to have known the Church of pre-Henrician days. But when the general assault on the Catholic sacramental system began, with the accession of Edward VI, Christopherson made his way to Louvain. Like Baynes, he was an author and he did useful service by extensive translations into Latin of the Greek Church historians. Pates of Worcester was the third

¹ Not including the Cardinal Legate.

of these returned exiles. He was of the generation of Gardiner and Bonner, and with them, in Henry VIII's time, he was employed in the royal service. It had been no small advantage to him that he was the nephew of John Longland, Bishop of Lincoln and confessor to the King. With such powerful patronage, Pates had risen rapidly and ecclesiastical offices and revenues had rained upon him. He was, in fact, little more than thirty when, in 1533, he was sent as resident ambassador to the court of Charles V, and for the next three years he accompanied the Emperor in his journeyings up and down Europe. It was while he held this post, in the critical years which saw Henry's repudiation of papal authority, and the first martyrdoms of the Catholics who remained loyal to the faith, that Pates changed sides. He refused to return to England when recalled and, a few years later, was attainted. Meanwhile, in 1541, he was named Bishop of Worcester by Paul III, and as Bishop of Worcester he attended the Council of Trent in its first series of sittings (1547) and again in 1551, when Julius III reassembled it.

The fourth of the returned exiles was Thomas Goldwell, Bishop of St. Asaph. He had gone abroad, apparently, in the very first months of Henry's anti-Catholic manœuvres, and at Padua, in 1532, he met Pole. Thenceforward his life and Pole's never ceased to be closely connected. From 1538 to 1547 Goldwell administered the ancient Roman hospice for English pilgrims that was soon to become the English College, and then, in 1547, he joined the new religious order popularly called the Theatines. Here Goldwell made immediate contact with the very heart of the contemporary Catholic movement to reform the Church. This religious order was the creation of two remarkable personalities, the Count Gaetano da Tiene, since canonized, and Gian Pietro Carafa, Bishop of Chieti. The purpose of the order was

pastoral work among the poor—preaching, catechizing, administration of the sacraments—and the Theatines were distinguished by an especially rigorous vow of poverty. Not only were the individual religious incapable of ownership, and the order also as an order, but the Theatines were not allowed in any way to beg. They proposed to depend for their living on what the Providence of God daily sent them. The order grew very slowly, but wherever it went, at Rome, at Naples, and at Venice, it gradually transformed the spiritual life of those cities which had been for so long the scene of serious clerical worldliness and indifference to spiritual duties. Carafa, by the time Goldwell became a Theatine, was a Cardinal and one of the chief personages in the curia. When Goldwell—bishop-elect of St. Asaph—returned to Rome in 1555, as one of the English Embassy of that year, Carafa was Pope, the *terribile* Paul IV.

Goldwell's novitiate was interrupted in 1549, when he went to serve Pole as a chaplain in the great conclave which so nearly elected a second English Pope. For the next four years Goldwell returned to Naples, to be professed and to work in the Theatine church there. The appointment of Pole as legate to England in 1553 drew Goldwell once more from his pastoral work, and in the September of that year he rejoined the Cardinal and in November went to England as his confidential envoy to the Queen.

Two of the new bishops—Morgan of St. Davids and David Pole of Peterborough—were professional canonists, administrators of proved worth : Pole had been for nearly twenty-five years Dean of the Arches and Vicar General to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Six of the eight bishops who remain to be considered had spent the greater part of their lives in academic posts. Brookes, of Gloucester, was a one-time Master of Balliol ; Oglethorpe, of Carlisle, was the President of Magdalen ; Scott, of Chester, Master of

Christ's ; Watson, of Lincoln, Master of St. John's College, Cambridge. White, Bishop first of Lincoln and then of Winchester, had been master and later warden of the famous Winchester school.

Gilbert Bourne, of Bath and Wells, had been for years in the service of Bonner. Brookes and Watson had been closely associated with Gardiner as his chaplains. Oglethorpe and Glyn were theologians of repute. Watson was perhaps the ablest man of all the new hierarchy. He was the friend of Ascham, and Cheke, and Sir Thomas Smith, and a force of the first importance in the Cambridge movement to revive and reform the teaching of Greek.

The eight bishops of this last group had all been close spectators, and even actors, in the religious revolution accomplished by Edward VI. How had they borne themselves in the hour of trial? Of Turberville of Exeter almost nothing seems to be known. From the fact that Brookes of Gloucester was, during all this time, one of Gardiner's chaplains and that, in Mary's time—Gardiner being now all-powerful—he was one of the first to be nominated to a see, we can safely deduce that, like his master, he did not conform to the new theology. And we can surely make the same guess about Bourne, of Bath and Wells (consecrated along with Brookes), who had remained a faithful chaplain to another of the bishops imprisoned by Edward VI for resistance to doctrinal changes, Bonner of London. About the remaining bishops we know something more.

Watson was, apparently, deep in Gardiner's confidence throughout all his fight with the Council in the time of Edward VI, and twice—in 1547 and in 1551—like his master he found himself in prison, the first time for a sermon denouncing the heresies of the Protestant party.

Glyn, as Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, could hardly escape the notice of the authorities if he

remained true to Catholic doctrine. He was, in fact, forbidden to lecture, but he played a great part, on the Catholic side, in the disputation about the Holy Eucharist, which was one of the features of the visitation of the university by the commission of 1549.

White also opposed the changes, and soon became known as a prominent cleric hostile to the new ways. He too was imprisoned in the Tower, in 1551, charged with receiving books and letters from abroad, and he remained in prison a whole year. And a year later he was excommunicated for his doctrinal insubordination.

The story of Owen Oglethorpe, Bishop of Carlisle from 1557, is less pleasing. He had a great repute as a theologian and had been a member of the commission which drew up in 1540 the statement of doctrine known as the King's Book. As President of Magdalen he had to rule a much divided college. After the abolition of the Mass there were riots at Magdalen, for the Catholic majority ignored the law and when they continued to celebrate Mass the reformers protested. Oglethorpe never faltered in his beliefs, but now he yielded to force, and not only consented to celebrate the new service, but recorded in writing, for the council, his repudiation of Transubstantiation and the practice of private masses. Even so, he failed to convince the Government of his sincerity, and in 1552 they brought about his removal from the presidency. In this timorousness, and in the readiness to temporize with principle as a matter of expediency, we can perhaps see something of the spirit that guided Oglethorpe in the critical first few months of Elizabeth's reign. When the new queen asked him to omit the elevation, as he was vesting to sing Mass in her presence on Christmas Day 1558, he refused. But, a month later, when all of his brethren had refused to crown her, realizing by now that her oath to protect the Church would be perjury,

Oglethorpe consented. And then, as the ensuing weeks made only too clear what Elizabeth's intentions were, he fell ill with anxiety and remorse. He lived long enough to refuse the Oath of Supremacy and to be deprived of his see, but died in the first days of 1560.

When Cardinal Pole died—on the same day as Queen Mary—17 November, 1558, five sees were already vacant, three of them since the summer only of that same year. Within six weeks of the Cardinal's death four more bishops had died. By the time the first parliament of the new reign assembled, January 1559, there were thus sixteen bishops only to take their seats in the House of Lords. The story is familiar of their united opposition to the new attack on the Catholic establishment. In Parliament the bishops, and in Convocation the bishops and the lower clergy, were unanimous in their loyalty to the Faith. The Elizabethan settlement of religion was the fruit of a lay victory over the rulers of the Church. And when the new Oath of Supremacy, which was the first foundation of the new settlement, was offered to the sixteen bishops, all save one refused it, and all who refused it were deprived of their sees. Of these fifteen Catholic champions, Tunstal alone was a survivor from the time before Henry's schism; it was the long-dead Dutch Pope, Adrian VI, who had made him a bishop. Three were originally creations of the Royal Supremacy in Henry VIII's time, Bonner, Heath and Thirlby. Pates owed his appointment, during his exile, to Paul III. But the remaining ten were the new bishops of the restoration: Morgan, White, Bourne, Baynes, Goldwell, Turberville, Scott, David Pole, Watson and Oglethorpe.

PHILIP HUGHES.

HOMILETICS

Quinquagesima. (Luke. xviii, 31-34.)

In today's Gospel, our Divine Lord relates to His Apostles how he was to suffer and be put to death. "We preach Christ crucified, to the Jews a stumbling-block, to the Gentiles foolishness—but to them that are called Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God." The Cross has always been a stumbling-block, yet nothing manifests better the power and wisdom of God. The Church wishes us, especially during Lent, to penetrate into the mysteries of the Passion that "we may be armed with the same thought".

The Cross is inevitable : it has become the very law of our fallen nature. "Man, born of woman, and living for a short time, is filled with many miseries." We have all our Agony, our Scourging, our Crown of Thorns, our Cross to bear, our Crucifixion. We are born through pain, in pain we die. It comes to us from a thousand sources—from our bodies, from our hearts, from our minds : from our enemies, from our friends : from the devil, from God.

Christ came to preach good news, especially to the poor and suffering—but He did not come to take away poverty and suffering. He said "Blessed are the poor, blessed they that mourn". By his own Passion, He cast a halo of glory around the world's sorrow, and won for all the strength to endure in peace. He came "not to root up the thorns that sin had sown, but to teach our bleeding fingers how to wreath them into a crown of glory". Hence St. Paul could write, "God forbid that I should glory save in the Cross of my Lord Jesus Christ". All the Saints have looked upon it as a most precious treasure. We cannot welcome it for itself, but for its beneficial consequences. Let us consider these benefits.

The word "virtue" denotes manliness, endurance, courage. There are wild forces within us which cannot be tamed but by painful effort. There is so much disorder in human nature which can be rectified only by suffering. We are diseased ; we have within us the cancerous growth of sinful self-love which can be cured alone by painful operations. There is no escaping it. Pain is the price we must

pay for health and vigour and purity of soul. Without it—no virtue, no manliness.

The crowning virtue is the love of God. It is easy to think that we possess this love, but let the pang of pain stab our sensitive flesh or spirit ! Then we shall see whether we love God more than self. Does that pain drive us to God and His Will, or do we become wrapt up in ourselves ? If we truly love God, it will add fuel to the fire of love—burning away the dross of self-love.

Thus, the whole character is strengthened and mellowed by the hallowing touch of the Cross. We meet some, indeed, soured and self-centred through life's trials—but the blame is only theirs. When God sends the cross, He sends the graces which Christ's Cross has won for us. He sends it—not in anger, but in love : that He may heal our soul's diseases, and draw it to His love in which is all happiness.

Sin too must be expiated. God's Justice demands this. Even as the wave, when it dashes itself against the rock is broken to pieces, so when we dash ourselves against the rock of God's Will we must suffer for it. "Without shedding of blood, there is no remission of sin." The debt remains after the guilt has been forgiven. The wounds have still to be healed, the baneful effects to be got rid of. By God's mercy suffering does this work. A little suffering borne aright may pay off a good deal of the debt, and go far to heal the ravages of past sin. Is not a man glad when he has paid off his debts, or when his health has been restored to him ? So does suffering, borne in the spirit of penance, gladden the heart.

Another advantage : it detaches us from earth's trifles, shows us our true position as wayfarers here on earth having no lasting abode, brings us down to the bed-rock of reality. Even with all life's sorrows and disappointments we centre our hearts so much on the passing things of this world. What would it be, if earth's lot were one of unalloyed happiness ?

"I thank Thee, Lord, that all our joy is touched with pain,
That sorrows fall on brightest hours, that thorns remain—
That earth's bliss may be our guide, and not our chain".

Surely, too, we wish to share in the great work of Redemption, to do our part in the salvation of souls. But

they are redeemed by the Cross, and that Cross must be the hall-mark of all our work for them. Oh, how valuable to the Church are her patient sufferers ! Grace goes out from them to all the world.

Hence the Imitation tells us that in the Cross is salvation, life, strength—joy of spirit and height of virtue. There is no health of soul, no hope of eternal life—but in the Cross. The wonder is that we have not a heavier cross to bear. But God knows our weakness, and tempers all to our needs and strength.

I might here quote to you an old English rhyme :

“I walked a mile with Pleasure—She chatted all the way,
And left me none the wiser—For all she had to say.
I walked a mile with Sorrow—And ne’er a word said she !
But oh ! the things I learned from her—When Sorrow
walked with me.” (R. Hamilton).

We must, of course, look beyond the mere human instrument or natural event. “The chalice which My Father hath given Me, shall I not drink it ?” Even if others wrong us, though God does not will their sin, He permits it for our greater good. All is foreseen in the plan of our sanctification. In reality, no one can do us any harm : we can only harm ourselves.

And how He sympathizes with us ! He suffered more, when on earth, by His sympathy for us than we actually suffer. And, now, He ever takes the rôle of Simon the Cyrenean, helping us along the rugged road. If He strikes with one hand, He caresses with the other. Thus, in spite of all, “My yoke is sweet and My burden light”.

Hence, the Cross does not mean unhappiness. Happiness predominated in His life, it is meant to predominate in ours. This a vale of tears, but it is also the garden of God where He wants His children to be brave and strong and joyous in their toil and conflicts. He rejoiced to suffer for His Father’s glory and our salvation. His love was stronger than His pain. That grace He has won for us. Yes, love solves the problem ; it makes all things bitter, sweet.

Let us think often and gratefully of all He endured for us, and of all He does and is for us. Let us ever remember the

pricele
will ne
rejoici
now.
time a
Ma
the M

Our
life. H
desert.
of His
inhere
Howev
in orde
Th
soldier
the me
worst,
have a
risk of
allies,
combi
truce
of God
wast a
should

Th
God, i
to tem
tempt
the cr
when
worke
you m
Li
genuin
shall

priceless advantages of the Cross. Then, love's strength will never fail us—we shall go on our way of the Cross rejoicing to be like Him, reaping our hundred-fold even now. And, then, hereafter—"I reckon the sufferings of this time are not worthy to be compared with the glory to come".

May our dear Lady of Sorrows give us an insight into the Mystery of the Cross—the power and wisdom of God !

First in Lent. (Matt. iv, 1-11.)

Our Divine Lord wished to share with us the trials of life. Hence we read that He was tempted by the devil in the desert. No evil suggestion could enter beneath the surface of His all holy soul. With us it is otherwise. There is evil inherent within us : the enemy has his allies inside the city. However, our good Lord allowed Himself to be tempted in order to encourage us in our struggles.

There is no escaping temptation. We are very real soldiers. The earthly soldier may never have to fight : at the most, it will be but for a short period of his life : at the worst, he can lose but the life of his body. Christ's followers have all to fight, and that every day of their lives—with the risk of losing their immortal souls. Moreover, the triple allies, the world, the flesh, and the devil are a formidable combination. There can be no security from them, no truce with them. Hence "when thou comest to the service of God, prepare thy soul for temptation". "Because thou wast acceptable to God, it was necessary that temptation should prove thee."

The powers of evil being entirely under the control of God, it must be for our greater good that they are allowed to tempt us. Hence, "Blessed is the man who endureth temptation, for when he has been proved he shall receive the crown of life". And St. James tells us to count it all joy when tempted, "knowing that the trying of your faith worketh patience, and patience hath a perfect work—that you may be perfect and entire, failing in nothing".

Like suffering, temptation tests our true worth, our genuine love. For "not everyone that saith Lord, Lord ! shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven—but he that doth

the will of My Father", in spite of every obstacle and repugnance. "The Lord your God trieth you, that it may appear whether you love Him or not." The soldier's courage is not shown in the barracks, but out in the battlefield. God's love is not proved by pious sentiments or beautiful thoughts, but by sternly battling with His enemies and ours.

Men employed in hard manual work develop their muscles. The muscles of the soul are developed by exercise and resistance to evil. And thus the whole character is formed and strengthened. At the same time, we are made humble by temptation. Left to ourselves we should yield. No natural will-power can prevail against our supernatural foes : they seem to be able to paralyse the will. Our only hope is in God. "Lord, save us—or we perish."

If we are truly humble and repentant, we shall fight the harder to resist temptations which are often the result of past indulgence in sin. Thus we derive good from evil.

"To them that love God all things work together for good." We are apt to say, "If it were not for this evil tendency, for that temptation, I would serve God so well!" Yet it is precisely our chief temptation which is one of our great means of serving God. Let us thank Him for it. A brave soldier is glad to fight for his country.

But all the same, he will not expose himself rashly to danger. We must avoid temptation, as far as possible. "Watch ye and pray—lest ye enter into temptation." We know how we have been attacked before, what has been an occasion of sin in the past : that we must guard against.

The devil is "the father of lies and the prince of darkness". If he knows that it would be useless to suggest grievous sin, he will strive to get us to make light of venial sin—and thus lead us on, little by little. If that ruse will not succeed, he makes a side attack. He stirs up grievances, real or imaginary, and fills the soul with bitterness. Or he plunges her into sadness, depression, darkness. Then he approaches with the temptation to serious sin, and there will be no buoyancy of soul, no strength to resist. Looking back on our past lives, how many times do we find ourselves deceived—if not driven to grievous sin! Perhaps the efficacy of our work, the usefulness of our lives, have been impaired by Satan's lying deceptions. We must indeed walk

warily,
tinual
disper
ness.

Sti
will th
way to
joined
the L
about
God i
utter
shall
conqu
in the
aside,
have
be co

G
threat
dang
Blesse
Son
than
we m
can r
Hum
S

Yet
Ther
enter
To c
conse
the g
the e
ous,
howe
blun
actu
their
for t

warily, never trusting to our own judgement—but continually praying. Prayer keeps us close to God. His light disperses hell's darkness : His strength relieves our weakness. "Watch ye and pray."

Still, however carefully we are on our guard, it is God's will that we should be tempted, that we should fight our way to Heaven. What, then, shall we do when the battle is joined? We have one weapon—Prayer. "Join thyself to the Lord, and endure." A submarine, sighting the enemy about to attack it, sinks into the sea. We must sink into God in the depths of the soul. We must cling to Him, with utter confidence. Has He not promised that no temptations shall come upon us without the necessary strength to conquer it? "Greater is He that is in you than he that is in the world." "Fear not, for I am with thee : turn not aside, for I am thy God. I have strengthened thee, and have helped thee. Behold all that fight against thee shall be confounded."

God's cause is attacked : the divine life within us is threatened : a member of Christ's Mystical Body is in danger. Surely He will come to the rescue ! Can our Blessed Lady stand by, and see us about to strike her Divine Son by sin—without intervening? What better prayer than the old simple cry "Jesus and Mary help me"? But we must pray with the certainty of being heard. We can never exaggerate the importance of this confidence. Humility and confidence force God to our aid.

Some cannot distinguish between temptation and sin. Yet there is a vast difference between the two. As St. Theresa said, "Mortal sin is such a monster that it cannot enter into a god-fearing soul, without her knowing it". To commit a grievous sin there must be—besides the full consent of the will—the knowledge or clear suspicion of the gravity of the matter. We may be careless in resisting the evil, and then put it away : this would be very dangerous, but it would not be more than a venial sin. Those, however, who—instructed in the Faith—have deliberately blunted their consciences may commit mortal sin without actually adverting to it. They do advert to the fact that their whole state of soul is wrong : thus, they are responsible for the evil they do.

For our comfort, we must remember that sin is in the will—not in the thoughts or feelings to which the will does not consent. And a strong temptation challenges and defies the will : we cannot rid ourselves of it in a moment. God promises aid, but not facility in conquering. It is better for us to feel our weakness.

We might conclude with the touching story of the little St. Theresa placing her crucifix on her pillow as she rose in the morning, saying to her Lord, "Thou hast worked enough and wept enough during Thy thirty-three years on earth—take now Thy rest. It is my turn to suffer and to fight". "Think diligently on Him who endured such opposition that you be not wearied. For you have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin." He resisted to the last drop of His blood. We must be determined to die, rather than betray Him by mortal sin.

Second in Lent. (Matt. xvii, 1-9.)

It is our duty to imitate Our Blessed Lord in the various events of His life. But how can He be our model in His Transfiguration ? We can share in the lowliness and sufferings of His human nature, but surely it is not for us here on earth to have any part in the glories of His divine nature. Oh, marvellous goodness of God ! It is possible for us to participate even in His divine glory—nay, it is His one desire. "I have come that they may have life, and may have it more abundantly." "The grace of God is life everlasting"—not shall be, merely in a distant future. Our earthly sojourn is not meant to be a miserable sort of existence which we must endure, hoping for better things hereafter. It is meant to be rich and full, a sharing in the divine life, the enjoyment of the hundredfold promised here and now. Alas ! some look upon religion as chiefly a system of prohibitions. No wonder they turn from it ! We are asked to deny ourselves and give up much, but only that we may receive much more. We must give up the things of a child, that we may receive the things of a man. God delights to give, even Himself : we glorify Him by receiving from Him.

If the soul in God's grace could only see itself, it would

appear transfigured, radiant in the light of God, vigorous with the life of God. As a child of its heavenly Father, become like to His Divine Son, it would hear the words, "This is my beloved son". If we thought more often of the rich treasures we possess, how much more interesting our religion would be ! Christianity is not merely accepting the revealed truths, not merely living up to a moral code, not merely imitating Christ in His external life and conduct—but sharing His interior life, "being made partakers of the Divine Nature". We all crave for life—and more of it. Here we can satisfy our desires beyond our wildest dreams. "If thou didst but know the gift of God !" No wonder that those who have to come to know and appreciate it have given up all things to possess it more fully, and have counted their loss but as nothing. We pray in the Mass that, as Our Lord took to Himself our human nature, so we may have part in His divine nature. More than one saint has boldly said, "God became man, that man might become God". Not, of course, in the sense of the pantheist—but divine by participation in His Life. We must not water down the strong statements of Holy Scripture. On the contrary, human words cannot express strongly enough the gifts of God.

What is the inner life of God Himself? Thought and love. The thought of the Father finding an infinite expression in God the Son, the Word of God. The love of Father and Son finding an infinite expression in God the Holy Ghost. What is the life of the soul? Thought and love. With sanctifying grace we receive superhuman powers to think and love, according to our capacity, as God thinks and loves. Faith and Charity are infused into the soul. Nay more, the Father, the Word of God and the Holy Ghost dwell and operate therein.

Our Blessed Lord speaks of the vine and the branches. The branch lives the life of the vine. United to Him, we share in His life. We are in Him, He is in us. St. Paul tells us that we are members of Christ's Mystical Body. The members of the body live the life of the body. How frequently he repeats the expression "in Christ"! "We are alive unto God in Christ". In Christ we become "new creatures"—"rooted and built up in Him".

This new life gives the soul a marvellous beauty. A cloud

in itself has no beauty, but when lit up by the sun behind it, we see a glorious sunset. Thus, the soul, irradiated by the light of Christ within it, possesses a beauty far surpassing all earthly loveliness. "Was it not worth while to die for so beautiful a thing?"—Our Lord asked a certain saint. "The glory which Thou hast given to Me, I have given to them." That divine glory and beauty which He possesses as the Son of God He shares with us.

In Baptism, the Holy Spirit came upon us as truly as once He came upon our Blessed Lady. We were united to Christ, engrafted on to the true vine, incorporated into His Mystical Body. Through this union, we share His Sonship, we have the right to all the care and love of our heavenly Father. We have received the Spirit of Sonship whereby we cry, "Abba, Father". "The Spirit Himself giveth testimony to our spirit that we are the sons of God." We have become members of the royal family of God, co-heirs with Christ to the eternal kingdom. Still more, we are living temples of God. The three Persons of the Blessed Trinity have taken up their abode with us. All the mysteries of the divine life are taking place within us. "Indeed the Lord is in this place, and I knew it not. How terrible is this place!" "It is no other than the House of God and the Gate of Heaven." This is heaven begun on earth, a foretaste of the eternal joys to come. Essentially, we are as united to God by grace as we shall be in glory. Only, now we see but "darkly, as in a glass"; now we cannot enjoy Him to the full; now we have, alas, the fatal power of losing all by sin.

Here is our hundredfold on earth, here is "the land flowing with milk and honey". "You are rich in all things, so that nothing is wanting to you in any grace." Nothing else can we call our own. Riches, health, loved ones, our very life—may be taken from us at any moment. But none can take from us the riches and strength and love and life of God. We lose them only by deliberate grievous sin. There is a story told of a little boy to whom his father had given a gold watch. The boy did not know its value, was playing with it in the street. A thief passed by, and saw this. He went into a shop and bought a cheap gaudy toy, and then, approaching the boy, he said, "I will give you this lovely toy, if you give me that thing you are playing with." The foolish boy

gladly
spirit
we go
us in
mom
birth
we b
bodil
treas
B
good
the
child
amor
othe
Sure
to in
"hid
most
is sin
thin
of m
grac
whic

in
figu
fou

spin
ove
neu

for
ste
wo
mo

gladly made the exchange. How often does this occur in the spiritual order ! We do not value Our Father's gift of grace, we go into the occasions of losing it by sin. The devil offers us in exchange his gaudily-painted toy, some miserable and momentary satisfaction of passion. And for that we sell our birthright, we give up all that makes life worth living. If we but knew the gift of God, we should be ready to lose our bodily life, any moment, rather than lose that priceless treasure.

But we can increase our wealth. Every supernaturally good act we do deepens the life of God within us, enhances the soul's beauty, makes us still more perfectly God's children. Our happiness for ever will depend upon the amount of grace we possess at the moment of death—in other words, on our capacity for knowing and loving God. Surely, life's chief aim should be to trade with our capital, to increase our riches. And life's chief joy should be to live "hidden with Christ in God", in the august company of the most Holy Trinity abiding within us ; while life's chief evil is sin which can deprive us of so great a good. "Glorious things are said of thee, thou city of the living God, thou soul of man." May she, the Mother of Grace, who was filled with grace beyond all others, help us to live up to the dignity which it confers upon us !

Third in Lent. (Luke, xi, 14-28.)

What a contrast with last Sunday's Gospel do we find in today's ! Then we meditated on the glorious Transfiguration of Our Divine Lord, now we gaze down into the foul depths of a soul in sin—haunted by devils.

The Gospel clearly connects the presence of these evil spirits with sin. There is the ghastly result of sin. It hands over the soul to the power of the devil. Man cannot remain neutral : if he refuses to serve God, he must serve Satan.

Lent is the season of penance, and hence it will be useful for us to revive our faith as to the evil of sin. The world, steeped in sin, looks upon it as mere weakness—or, at the worst, an injury done to our neighbour. But, alas, it is far more serious than that. It is an offence against the Infinite

God : and, as far as man can do anything infinite, he does it when he offends God. "Who can understand sin?" No human mind can fathom the depths of its evil.

Let us look at sin first in its relation towards God. He holds us in the hollow of His hand : we are utterly dependent on Him. At the same time, He is the kindest of fathers who has never done us anything but good. Yet we dare to rise up in defiance against Him, we refuse to obey His commands, we unite our voices with those of the rebel angels and cry out, "I will not serve !" "Vile dust dares to irritate such tremendous Majesty." (St. Bernard.) On every side, we see perfect obedience to God's laws. All the forces of Nature, seemingly so chaotic, obey the laws which He has laid down. Man alone, on earth, is the exception. He alone dares to disturb the universal harmony. Yet, these laws are made for our good. God only bids us do what is really conducive to our welfare, or forbids what is harmful for us. What an insult to prefer our own blind and corrupted will to the all-holy and all-wise Will of God ! What base ingratitude to the best of benefactors !

It is true that God cannot suffer for our sins. He would remain untouched even if the whole world rose against Him. But the Word Incarnate, our Blessed Lord, in His mortal life could and did suffer for our sins. They were always before Him. We can think of Him, as a little boy, bursting into bitter tears. It needed all the ingenuity of His Mother's love to console Him. What caused Him those tears ? Our sins. They reached their climax in His Passion. His soul was sorrowful unto death at the thought of sin. He was flayed alive for our sins of the flesh. He was crowned with thorns, piercing into His very brain, for our sins of thought. He was treated as a fool, "saturated with contempt", for our pride. Finally, our sins did Him to death on the Cross.

An old English writer has said : "On the white body of my Lord I can trace, in letters of blood, the sins of my life." At least in soul He suffered a distinct pain for every sin, mortal or venial, that we shall ever commit.

To turn to ourselves. Mortal sin is suicide, the destruction of the divine life within us, with all its glorious riches. "The wages of sin is death." The dead soul becomes more foul than any rotting corpse : it is turned into an abode of

devils. Hell has begun on earth ! "He who loveth iniquity, hateth his own soul."

But let us suppose that God, in His mercy, has forgiven us. Many of the baneful effects of sin may still remain : the blindness of mind, the weakness of the will, the inclination to evil. Our souls are, to some extent, wounded and crippled. We should love them as a mother would love her only child. Imagine that, through her carelessness, the child had met with an accident and become a cripple. She would never forgive herself. We, too, must never forgive ourselves—though we know that our merciful Saviour is so ready to forgive us, when repentant. "How could I have been so foolish as to insult Almighty God ? How could I have been so heartless as to pain my dear Lord so much ? How could I have been so cruel to my own soul ?"

What reparation we owe both to God and to ourselves ! That spirit of reparation will urge us to heal, by penance, the wounds of past sins. It will be our best safeguard against sin in the future. When tempted, we shall say, "I am weak enough and wounded enough, I must not add wound to wound. My debt to God's Justice is big enough, I cannot increase it."

One may say, "That is all very well—true as far as it goes ; but I did not think of these things, when I committed sin." No, the sinner will not think—he turns his mind away from the light. But surely that will not excuse him. If an engine-driver had, through neglect, caused his train to be wrecked and many lives to be lost—it would be of no avail for him to allege that he had not thought of the consequences. How much more criminal is it not to think where the interests of God are concerned ! "But the temptation was so strong. I could not help it." Yet, God has promised to give strength to resist. We sin because we do not pray for grace, or because we rashly expose ourselves to temptation. In the latter case, we cannot expect help from God.

No ! sin is inexcusable. We must fully recognize that. "It is into broken vessels that God pours the oil of His Mercy." We must be broken, contrite. Then "a humbled and a contrite heart Thou wilt not despise". Sin is a terrible evil, beyond words to describe. But precisely because it is so, our Divine Redeemer wishes to save us from it. He has

gained a complete victory over it, by His Passion and Death. Infinite reparation has been made to the outraged majesty of God ; copious grace has been won to resist every inclination to sin, and to repair the evil of past sin. Our rescue from the power of Satan has been effected. Undoubtedly there is much sin in the world, but that testifies nothing against the complete victory won. All who sincerely approach the Divine Redeemer share in the spoils of His victory, and conquer sin. "With Him is copious Redemption." So copious indeed that we may derive good from sin. "O happy fault of Adam that deserved to have so great a Redeemer." If we take the means offered us in the Church, we can turn our past sins into a source of blessing, and make them stepping-stones to sanctity. Truly magnificent is Christ's victory !

Let us then be determined to share in it. Let us never be deceived by the lax ideas of the world, never become callous owing to the sight of so much sin around us. "Fly from sin as from the face of a serpent." We should often pray for a share in Our Lord's hatred and horror of it, which He experienced in His Agony. All through life we should strive to repair the evil of the past. Thus our very sins may be the occasion of the greatest blessings. Thus shall we participate in Our Lord's conquest of sin and Satan. "Bless the Lord, O my soul, and never forget all He hath done for thee. Who forgiveth all thy iniquities : who healeth all thy diseases. Who redeemeth thy life from destruction : who crowneth thee with mercy and compassion."

FRANCIS PRIME, C.S.S.R.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

I. ASCETICAL AND MYSTICAL THEOLOGY

ST. TERESA OF AVILA wrote primarily for her Carmelite daughters, but her doctrine is not applicable to them alone. In the collect for her feast we pray that we may be nourished by her heavenly teaching ("coelestis ejus doctrinae pabulo nutriamur"), and in this modern world which has such an insatiable appetite for sensual pleasures, is swept along by fugitive joys, and in which so many seek a compromise between the spirit of the world and the spirit of God, there are to be found in ever increasing numbers generous souls who, desirous of a more perfect life, look with sadness upon such empty pleasures, and cannot slake their thirst at such perishable sources. They are made for greater things, they feel in themselves a divine nostalgia, a vague but deep aspiration for union with God. There is within them a seed of whole-heartedness which with encouragement will blossom forth and will bear fruit in a total surrender of self to the divine attractions. Such souls will understand and enter into the spirit of this great Mistress of the spiritual life. She represents the Christian ideal, perfect love of God and of one's neighbour, as requiring a heart that knows no half-measures. For St. Teresa the love of God is the loving intimacy of a heart that belongs *wholly* to Him, and the degree of this intimacy will be in proportion to the soul's generosity. Such love of God cannot be conceived without its extending to the love of souls, and this requires great generosity, for to love God is to serve Him, and to love souls is to serve them in the forgetfulness of self and the sacrifice of self for them. *Totality*, whole-hearted self-surrender, this is the characteristic of Teresian spirituality, a spirituality in which special emphasis is laid on the apostolic aspect.

This ideal of St. Teresa is well set forth in the first chapter of a recent book by Fr. Gabriel of St. Mary Magdalene, O.C.D.,¹ professor of spiritual theology at the theological faculty of the Discalced Carmelites in Rome. The dis-

¹ *Sainte Thérèse de Jésus, Maîtresse de vie spirituelle*, translated from the Italian of Fr. Gabriel de Ste. M. Madeleine, O.C.D., by M. M. AM. du Cœur de Jésus. Pp. xv + 187. (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer. Carmel de Rochefort, Belgium. 21 fr.)

cussion of moral perfection in that chapter raises the question of the position of mysticism in St. Teresa's conception of the Christian life, and this forms the subject of the second chapter. Two further chapters are devoted to the study of the saint's doctrine in her "Way of Perfection" and the "Interior Castle". A final chapter, entitled "*St. Teresa of Jesus*", deals with what may be said to be central in her teaching and to influence the whole of her spirituality, namely the place which the Sacred Humanity occupies in the soul's ascent to the most sublime heights of the supernatural life. The saint will not allow us to separate ourselves deliberately from the Humanity of Christ at any stage of the life of prayer. If the divine action is such as to absorb one in a prayer in which images play no part, well and good; but purposely to exclude images of the Sacred Humanity as if It were an obstacle to the life of prayer is wrong and dangerous.

In any study of the spirituality of St. Teresa one asks what is her teaching on the mystical problems that have been so prominent in recent years. Thus, what is the connexion between mystical contemplation and Christian perfection? Contemplation according to the Saint includes those degrees or states of prayer which she describes in her books under the name of prayer of recollection, of quiet, or of union, the distinctive characteristic of which is the more or less clear experience of God's action in the soul. This experience of the soul's passivity is for her the mark of contemplation. The writer concludes: "The terminology of St. Teresa is somewhat different from that of the modern Thomistic school. It was chosen from a different point of view, from a psychological rather than ontological point of view. Anyone who wishes to make a comparative study of the different spiritual opinions of mystical theologians cannot neglect these divergences without running the risk of confusing the different expressions and confusing rather than elucidating the questions at issue" (p. 43).

According to the Saint contemplation is not necessary to sanctity, but it is a powerful means of holiness; it is an entirely gratuitous gift of God which one cannot merit, but for which God invites us to prepare ourselves by perfect abnegation of ourselves and constant recollection. Though not

necessary for sanctity, it is generally granted to the soul that is entirely generous. This book forms an excellent introduction to the reading of St. Teresa, and is one of a series, *Bibliothèque du Carmel Thérésien*, which is being edited in order to make better known the spiritual teaching of the Reformed Carmelite School.

In her Book of Foundations St. Teresa writes : "Wherein lies the highest perfection ? It is clear that it does not lie in interior delights, not in great raptures, not in visions, not in the spirit of prophecy, but in the conformity of our will to the will of God, so that there shall be nothing we know He wills that we do not will ourselves with our whole will, and accept the bitter as joyfully as the sweet, knowing it to be His Majesty's will" (Ch. 5, Stanbrook edition). This ideal is worked out and illustrated in a simple but telling manner in Fr. Kearney's latest book *Learn of Me*.¹ It is the third of his books to present a "fundamental and simple view of the Spiritual Life—of holy living—that may be helpful to the ordinary souls who desire to live in friendship with God", and treats in detail of the great principle that governed Our Lord's life, "I always do the things that please Him". The first part treats of our dependence on Christ and the love of conformity and of submission, and the second is devoted to the cross in the spiritual life. The chapters on the subtlety of self-seeking and on self-abnegation are searching and particularly well worked out. This is a welcome and useful book of meditations, both for religious and priests, for seminarists and the laity.

The late Fr. Bede Jarrett's book on *The Religious Life*² has appeared in its third edition. It is very useful for one who wishes to study at none too great length the history of religious life. After discussing its origins and the primitive rules, the writer devotes a chapter to the purpose of religious life. He then follows its development through the centuries, and in a final chapter speaks of religious life in England.

The authorship of the *Imitation of Christ* has frequently been a subject of controversy. Fr. James van Ginneken, S.J., contended that Gerard Groote (*d.* 1384) was really its

¹ *Learn of Me*, by Rev. John Kearney, C.S. Sp. Pp. xvii + 292. (London : Burns Oates and Washbourne Ltd. 6s.)

² *The Religious Life*, by Fr. Bede Jarrett, O.P. Pp. 174. (London : Burns Oates and Washbourne Ltd. 3s.)

author. He edited Groote's *Spiritual Diary* according to the Lübeck manuscript, and contended that Thomas à Kempis had merely enlarged this and translated it into Latin. This view seems to be rejected by the majority of critics. Fr. J. Malaise, S.J., has now translated Groote's *Spiritual Diary* from the original Netherlandish.¹ He has not done this with any intention of resuscitating an old controversy, nor in order to belittle À Kempis or to extol Groote, but simply to increase the love which all have for the *Following of Christ* and to give a faithful rendering of the original text in simple and idiomatic English. He provides a table for a comparison of Groote's work with Books II and IV of À Kempis.

Henri Ghéon has written previously about saints who are comparatively well known ; he now writes about a saint with whom people have considerably less acquaintance.² St. Vincent Ferrer was born in Valencia in the days when the Church was rent asunder by the Great Schism. He joined the Order of Friar Preachers. A Lector in Logic at Lerida, no mean writer, as is evinced by his dialectic treatises and by his *Treatise on the Spiritual Life*, and a famous lecturer in theology, he became first and foremost a popular and powerful preacher whose sermons converted thousands. In the matter of the Schism he sided with the Avignon Pope and was greatly instrumental in bringing the unhappy dissension to an end. After the resignation of Peter de Luna, Gerson wrote to him, "But for you this union could never have been achieved". But most astounding of all was his remarkable work as a missionary, chiefly in Spain and France, an apostolate that abounded in the miraculous. Lovers of Ghéon's earlier works will likewise welcome this ; it will encourage readers to seek for further knowledge of the Saint.

Mme. Mallie-Guillemin³ has written a short life of St. Francis of Sales for children : a grandmother relates the story of the saint to her grandchildren each evening ; though simply and pleasantly told, its style might not appeal to English children.

¹ *The Following of Christ*, the *Spiritual Diary* of Gerard Groote ; translated from the Netherlandish text of James van Ginneken, S.J., by Joseph Malaise, S.J. Pp. 269. (America Press, New York. 1939.)

² *St Vincent Ferrer*, by Henri Ghéon, translated by F. J. Sheed. Pp. xv + 190. With one map. (London : Burns Oates and Washbourne Ltd. 6s.)

³ *La Vie aimable de Saint François de Sales*, par Geneviève Mallie-Guillemin. Pp. 127. (Paris : Editions Téqui. 8 fr.)

In *Looking on Jesus*¹ Fr. Blakely, S.J., has published the short editorials on the Sunday Gospels which he wrote some years ago for *America*. The sermons are short—none runs to more than two pages—simple, and refreshing in the lessons and ideas which they draw from the Sunday Gospels.

*Theologia Ascetica*² is a Latin version of a German work which Fr. Hertling, S.J., published in 1930, being the lectures on Ascetical theology delivered by him at the University of Innsbruck. From this emended edition the historical excursions which appeared in the original German have been omitted. In so small a work one is agreeably surprised to find some twenty pages devoted to the standard of perfection which the Church requires for canonization. The principles of the spiritual life are set forth very clearly, and many of the notes illustrate the practical purpose of the book. Written in simple Latin, it is a succinct and useful introduction to a deeper study of spiritual theology.

Readers of the life of the Little Flower will know how great was her devotion to the Mother of God who had smiled on her and cured her mysterious illness. She did not like to think that Our Lady was put before souls as inaccessible, as one so sublime that she might seem beyond our imitation. She wished to see Our Lady presented as one who practised the hidden virtues and lived by faith, and to know that this presentation rested on truth and not on mere suppositions. In her *Novissima Verba* she said: "It is not well to say things about her that are unlikely, or that we do not know, as, for example, that at the age of three she went to the Temple to offer herself to God with feelings of extraordinary fervour and on fire with love, whereas perhaps she went quite simply in obedience to her parents. Why, again, say, apropos of the prophetic words of the venerable Simeon, that the Blessed Virgin from that moment had constantly before her eyes the Passion of Jesus?—'Thy own soul a sword *shall* pierce.' It was clearly a prophecy of what would come later. For a sermon on the Blessed Virgin to bear fruit it must show her *real* life, such as the Gospel gives us a glimpse of, not her *supposed* life. And it is easy to see

¹ *Looking on Jesus*, by Paul L. Blakely, S.J. Pp. 116. (New York America Press. 1939. \$1.)

² *Theologia Ascetica*; Ludovicus Hertling, S.J. Pp. 201. (Romae: Typis Pont. Univ. Gregorianae. 15 lire.)

that her real life, both at Nazareth and after, must have been quite ordinary." It was but natural that St. Thérèse should wish devotion to Our Lady to play its part in her little way of spiritual childhood; that she should seek in the Mother of God those little but solid virtues which are within the reach of little souls. Since she herself had suffered such acute trials of Faith, it was natural that the saint should realize how beneficial for souls was the example of Our Lady's life of Faith. And so a few months before her death she expressed a wish to put into writing her thoughts on the Blessed Virgin. She did so in her poem, *Pourquoi je t'aime Marie!* Fr. G. Martin, whose books on the saint are well known, has now written a book based on this poem.¹ In each chapter he takes one or more stanzas of the poem and comments on them. We are thus led to contemplate the different mysteries in Our Lady's life, and to see how we may imitate her; for it is in such imitation that St. Thérèse sees true devotion to the Mother of God. The book will help souls to enter more into the secret of the Little Flower and her little way of Spiritual Childhood.

LAURENCE P. EMERY.

II. PHILOSOPHY

We have lately been reminded by the Holy Father in his Encyclical "Summi Pontificatus" that the most convincing test of the truth or falsity of any system of ideas is to be found in the practical effects which that system produces. "No defence of Christianity could be more effective than the present straits. From the immense vortex of error and anti-Christian movements there has come forth such a crop of poignant disasters as to constitute a condemnation surpassing in its conclusiveness any merely theoretical refutation." Ideas, if they are alive, cannot remain cut off from contact with and influence on the lives of men, as if they were anchorites in their cells, but inevitably produce an effect in the world, and the crop proclaims the nature of the tree.

¹ *How to Love Our Lady as St. Thérèse of the Child Jesus Loved Her*, by the Rev. G. Martin, translated by E. F. Peeler. Pp. 164. (London: Burns Oates and Washbourne Ltd. 5s.)

The attempt to confine philosophy to mere speculation with no influence on action is therefore foredoomed to failure, but it does not follow that any system of ideas which results in a way of living is therefore properly called "philosophy". If it were, Christianity would certainly deserve the name. In fact there is a certain confusion of thought involved in the defence by an Erasmus of the "Philosophy of Christ" when put forward as a rival to the philosophies of Plato or Aristotle. Both result in a way of life, but their origins are not the same. For this reason some wish to deny that there can be a "Christian Philosophy" even though Christianity is a "wisdom" and a guide of life. This debate is one not merely of academic but of practical importance, since its solution will result in granting or denying to a man who is a philosopher and a Christian the use of his Christian outlook in philosophical debates. He may have to drop his Christianity when philosophizing.

Fr. James has therefore done a useful work in bringing together a number of essays bearing on this problem,¹ in which he discusses this question as his central theme, though he approaches it from many sides, and shows its bearing both on morality and action. As he treats it, the question is closely connected with the one he formerly discussed in his book on *The Desire of God in the Philosophy of St. Thomas*, and he formulates it by asking: "Is it possible to discover some secret unity between the natures of Christianity and Philosophy, some hidden intelligible connexion between a divine revelation accepted by faith, and man's philosophy, the instrument of which is man's own natural reason?" As readers of his work on the "Desire of God" will anticipate, he answers this question in the affirmative, and accepts Maritain's conclusion that a philosophy which takes its rise in the mind of a Christian as opposed to a non-Christian undergoes in the concrete case a change of *state* rather than of *nature*. He does not consider, however, that Maritain fully recognizes the intimacy of the union of Christianity and philosophy in the mind of the Christian philosopher: their union, in Fr. James' view, is essential, not accidental; or at least, they are like treacle pudding—not pudding with

¹ *Christian Philosophy*, by Fr. James, O.S.F.Cap. (Burns Oates & Washbourne 6s.)

treacle. There seems to be some danger here of confusing the origins of philosophy with its grounds—for in fact every philosophy is the product of the mental soil which produces it, and so may be permeated by Christianity or, say, by Buddhism; but the grounds of it must be rational certainty, and the test of its truth, its rationality.

Since the question is so fundamental it has, of course, a bearing on all sorts of activity, whether speculative or practical. So in his appreciation of the "Significance of St. Bonaventure" Fr. James makes the pregnant remark that "the clash of today is between Christianity as a world-system, that is, a body of truth which is both theological and philosophic, and philosophies which, because they claim to be interpretations of the whole of life, have become in fact religious creeds in one form or another". Thus our attitude to the events of every day will be affected by our views on this, at first sight academic, question of the possibility of a definitely Christian philosophy. Plainly also the questions of morality will be affected by similar considerations: both the broad issues of its nature, and the particular questions of moral conduct being influenced by our method of approach—whether we come to them by way of Christian philosophy or of non-Christian—for there is no such thing as philosophy *in vacuo*.

It is hardly necessary at the present moment to argue that the philosophy adopted by a state must have important effects on education: the facts stare us in the face, whether in the liberalism which has been taken as the state philosophy in our own country, or the various forms of state absolutism which have established themselves in others. Fr. James does a useful thing in showing to what results the adoption of Christian philosophy would lead in the sphere of the education of the masses and of the individual.

This is a book small in size, but large in ideas.

The great work which M. Maritain has for some years been doing for the elucidation and amplification of the Thomist philosophy happily continues. There is not a dull line in his writing, and while his exposition of the substance of this philosophy is masterly, his application of its principles to current problems and theories is, owing to his intimate acquaintance with all phases of modern thought, invaluable

In a recent book (*Quatre Essais sur l'Esprit dans sa Condition Charnelle*)¹ these qualities are very manifest. The last two essays are a pendant to and a completion of the ideas which M. Maritain has set out in his great treatise on *The Degrees of Knowledge* concerning the natural mystical experience and the relations between science and philosophy. The first essay of the book is an acute examination of the discoveries of Freud and of the Psycho-analysts ; while the second on "Sign and Symbol" deals with the theory of Sign and its relation to magic and religion. In the first essay M. Maritain gives full credit to Freud as a discoverer of new truths in the realm of psychology, and as an investigator of genius in psycho-analysis. He insists at the outset on the necessity of distinguishing clearly between the psycho-analytical method of investigation directed towards the cure of neuroses and the philosophy of Freud. Of the latter M. Maritain has nothing good to say, but in dealing with the psycho-analytic method he admits without reservation that Freud is right in maintaining the existence of the Unconscious in the strict meaning of the term. He finds no difficulty from a philosophical point of view in doing this, once the idealist postulate of the identity of being with known being is discarded, as it is in Thomist metaphysics. While recognizing Freud's genius in his methods of exploring the Unconscious, M. Maritain insists that it is absurd to make psycho-analysis the sole means for the cure of neuroses ; it is, in fact, "one of the therapeutic instruments for the cure of certain neuroses" only. Moreover, he considers that Freudian psychology is to a great extent vitiated by his materialism, by the lowest kind of pseudo-metaphysics, "which combines all the prejudices of determinist and materialist scientism with all the prejudices of irrationalism". The essay on sign and symbol, after a summary of the theory of signs, discusses the use of signs by primitive man, especially in the practise of magic. According to M. Maritain the mentality of the savage is of the same nature as ours, but is in a different state : it is dominated by the imagination, and so, instead of understanding, as we do, that the sign presents to us the thing signified "in alio esse", i.e. "in esse intentionali", the primitive considers that it presents it to him under the same

¹ Desclée de Brouwer et Cie. 26 fr.

form of being, i.e. "in esse physico", as that in which it exists in itself. Hence he identifies the sign with the thing signified, as is seen in the case of totems, of idols, and perhaps most strikingly in the case of names, where the name of a man is regarded as being the man. So Sir James Frazer writes: "Primitive man regards his name as a vital portion of himself and takes care of it accordingly", though it would be truer to say that he regards it as being himself, as the examples adduced by Frazer prove.

In opposition both to the Positivist view that the only truths knowable by man are those which belong to the mathematical and physico-mathematical sciences—religion, philosophy, etc., being but the legacy of the primitive mentality, and so directly opposed to scientific truth—and to the Bergsonian opinion that though magic and science are incompatible, yet other forms of knowledge than the mathematical and physico-mathematical can give truth—among them being metaphysics and religion, though the latter has a common origin with magic—M. Maritain maintains that these three: the physico-mathematical, metaphysical and theological sciences, are different degrees of knowledge, which have gradually become differentiated from their common inchoate form of magic. By a process of progressive differentiation human knowledge has, he holds, passed through different states or conditions of existence and use. So it has passed from the magical state to the logical one, and can never return to the former.

Every student of philosophy and science knows the immense part played by signs and symbols in the construction of both these forms of knowledge, and consequently it is easy to see that the essay on these has a bearing on the last one in this book, which is concerned with the relations between science and philosophy. In it M. Maritain develops the ideas which he put forward in his work, *The Degrees of Knowledge*, with special reference to the views of the Viennese School of logicians. While repudiating the Positivist inspiration of this School, M. Maritain notes that the views which he had put forward in his *Degrees of Knowledge*, written before he had taken cognisance of the work of the School of Vienna, are in accord with the tenets of that School on the character of modern science, which they hold

to be
possibi
the pla
and co
means
out in
ontolo
make
entia r
rescue
been
impos
metap
atheis
Schoo
out, q
exclud
ledge
shows
much

Fr
and su
one of
almos

Th
of the
transl
called
Franc
great
an un
Thom
turnin
core o
appea
for th
the c
philos
they i

¹ St
Vo

to be in no sense a philosophy. In science the permanent possibility of sensible verification and measurement holds the place which "nature" or "essence" holds for philosophy, and consequently the scientist leads up to his definitions by means of a certain number of physical operations carried out in determinate conditions, and not by means of essential ontological characteristics. In order to do this he has to make use of rational constructions based on reality, i.e. of *entia rationis*, or logical beings, which thereby have been rescued from the oblivion and ignominy to which they have been consigned for many years. If this be so, it will be impossible for the scientist *qua* scientist to pronounce on metaphysical matters, and such a phrase as "scientific atheism" will be quite meaningless, as the Viennese School hold it to be. This attitude is, M. Maritain points out, quite opposed to that of Dialectical Materialism, which excludes all speculative knowledge, and confines knowledge to practical action, a proceeding which, as he clearly shows, undermines and destroys science altogether, just as much as it destroys philosophy and religion.

From what has been said it may be seen how illuminating and suggestive is this latest of M. Maritain's writings—every one of his essays throwing out ideas which could be developed almost indefinitely.

There has also appeared in the last few weeks an outline of the basic ideas of M. Maritain's philosophy in an English translation. This is his course of "Seven Lessons on Being" called in this translation *A Preface to Metaphysics*¹. The French edition was published some years ago, but it is of great value to have this English version, as M. Maritain has an unequalled gift for presenting the philosophy of St. Thomas in a form adapted to the modern world, and so turning old lamps into new. This little book gives us the core of Thomist metaphysics without the somewhat repellent appearance which it presents in so many scholastic writings, for though these studies were prepared as a preliminary to the continuation of M. Maritain's French text-book of philosophy—which so far has not advanced beyond Logic—they have themselves nothing of the text-book form.

¹ Sheed and Ward. 6s.
Vol. xviii.

Another text-book in French of a much slighter kind has recently been published. This is by M. Jolivet,¹ and has all the clarity which we have come to expect from his pen. It is a model of conciseness, and within the very narrow limits which he has set himself the author has given a most lucid exposition of Thomist teaching reviewed in the light of modern knowledge. He devotes a considerable part of this volume to the discussion of the classification of the methods of the sciences ; a matter which is evidently of the first importance for the treatment of the philosophy of nature which is to follow. We are promised three further volumes to complete the treatise, the first of which is to deal with Psychology, the next with General Metaphysics, Epistemology and Natural Theology, and the last with the Philosophy of Art and Ethics. It will be seen from this list of contents and the proportion of space allotted to the various sections that this is no stereotyped scholastic text-book ; a fact which jumps to the eyes on opening the present volume, for it will probably open at an illustration. I do not remember that there has been an illustrated book of scholastic philosophy since the early printed editions of St. Thomas' commentaries on Aristotle, and then the books were not nearly so lavishly illustrated as this one. So M. Jolivet's idea is new, but not brand-new.

R. P. PHILLIPS.

¹ Régis Jolivet—*Traité de Philosophie I. Logique, Cosmologie*. Published by Emmanuel Vitte. No price stated.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

EUCCHARISTIC FAST

Through a misunderstanding the priest fails to arrive for the Sunday mid-day Mass at which 200 people are present. May the parish priest celebrate Mass non-fasting in order to enable the people to fulfil their obligation? (H.)

REPLY

(i) This familiar difficulty was ably discussed by Mgr. Cronin in this REVIEW, vol. II, 1931, p. 90. The answer to the question, as it stands, is usually given in the negative, since it is the practically unanimous teaching of all the authorities that the law of observing the fast is graver than that of hearing Mass. Quite often we find that a reply of the Holy Office, 2 December, 1874, is quoted in this sense, namely, as expressly comparing the gravity of the two laws and declaring in favour of the fasting law. The text, as contained in *Fontes* IV, n. 1034, is as follows: "Se per ragione di scandalo o di ammirazione si possa giammai celebrare la seconda messa dopo la prima quando già è stato infranto il digiuno. R. Negative." It is pointed out, and we think rightly, that in this context "scandal" is not to be taken in the strict theological sense of being the occasion of another's sin, but in the looser sense of "admiratio". Nevertheless, as is commonly taught, the necessity of avoiding grave scandal, in the strict sense of the word, is a sufficient reason for celebrating non-fasting. The law is an unusually grave one, but it cannot be claimed, from the direction of the Holy Office, that we may never apply to it the principle that no positive law binds *cum gravi incommodo*. The kind of scandal which sometimes may be feared, as the writers note, includes the danger of stirring up animosity and ill-feeling against the priest. It would seem that this could easily be removed by explaining the circumstances to the people, though even here one must go warily. In Mgr. Cronin's recollection, a priest who explained that he could not say Mass because he had taken the ablution was understood to have frankly admitted that he could not get absolution. A commoner and

more actual example of real scandal would be the fear that many people would not attend Mass elsewhere, though they could easily do so and are bound to do so.

(ii) It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that what all the argumentation and theological dexterity of the writers amounts to is that one may say Mass non-fasting, in order that the people may fulfil their Sunday obligation, a principle which is, in theory at least, almost universally rejected. But, since it is a matter of positive law, it may well be questioned in these days when priests occasionally obtain, for purposes of public utility, permission to celebrate Mass after taking liquid nourishment, whether the older doctrine concerning the relative gravity of the fasting law as compared with that of the Sunday precept can be sustained. Thus Dr. Mulders, after discussing the doctrine given above, writes in N.K.S. 1933, p. 55: "*Humiliter vero censemus hodie, mitigata cum sit praxis dispensandi in ieiunio naturali, etiam in favorem sacerdotis celebrantis, alias quoque causas excusantes tuto posse admitti. Speciatim, cum iam ob solam causam privatam utilitatis vel devotionis sacerdotis obtineri possit dispensatio, nullo modo auderemus damnare parochum, qui ob solam rationem quod notabilis fidelium pars die dominica vel festo de praecepto secus Missae adstare nequiret, Sacrum iteraret.*"¹ We are in agreement with this opinion.

(iii) The circumstance usually supposed in this question is that a priest has inadvertently taken the second ablution. If he has taken a breakfast of solid food, Mass may be said for any of the very urgent reasons outlined by the commentators on Canons 808 and 858 §1. But, even at the risk of appearing illogical, we are not prepared to extend the opinion given under (ii) to this case, and to concede that Mass be said after a solid breakfast solely in order that a notable number of the faithful may fulfil their obligation. For, whatever may be the developments at some future time, the indults at the moment permit only liquid nourishment for appropriate reasons before Mass, and the opinion of Dr. Mulders, which we think reasonable, is based on the present law.

E. J. M.

¹ Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, XV, 1938, p. 168, for a discussion of the conditions on which indults for non-fasting celebration may be obtained.

AUDITO CAPITULO, PAROCHO, ETC.

The canons frequently require certain persons to be consulted, e.g. *audito paracho*. What is the effect on the validity and legality of actions if this clause is not observed? (X.Y.Z.)

REPLY

Canon 105 : Cum ius statuit Superiorem ad agendum indigere consensu vel consilio aliquarum personarum : 1. Si consensus exigatur, Superior contra earundem votum invalide agit ; si consilium tantum, per verba, ex.gr. : *de consilio consultorum*, vel *audito Capitulo, paracho*, etc., satis est ad valide agendum ut Superior illas personas audiat ; quamvis autem nulla obligatione teneatur ad eorum votum, etsi concors, accedendi, multum tamen, si plures audiendae sint personae, concordibus earundem suffragiis deferat, nec ab eisdem, sine praevalenti ratione, suo iudicio aestimanda, discedat.

Canon 1680 §1 : Nullitas actus tunc tantum habetur, cum in eo deficiunt quae actum ipsum essentialiter constituunt, aut solemnities seu conditiones desiderantur a sacris canonibus requisitae sub poena nullitatis.

(i) We have added the word "validity" to the above question, since this is the point of most consequence. It is clear from the canon that, provided the consultation takes place, the law is observed even though the advice tendered is rejected, whereas if the consent of certain persons is required an act is invalid without it. It is equally clear that the ordinary rules of prudence require superiors, particularly in matters of gravity, to seek the opinion of others who are competent to speak, even though this may not be ordered by any positive law.

The question to be decided is whether, in the event of a superior failing to consult certain persons, as determined by the law, his subsequent act is invalid. Reference to any of the usual commentators on this canon reveals a difference of opinion, largely due to the words "satis est ad valide agendum", which are capable of different interpretations.

The text states that it is sufficient for the validity of an action if advice is sought, but it does not state that the action is invalid if advice is not sought. On the other hand, the word "valide" in the phrase does seem to imply that the omission affects the validity of a subsequent action. If the text read "satis et necesse est etc.", the meaning would be quite clear. One way of solving this doubt would be to rely on the principle that actions are presumed to be valid unless their invalidity is clear : it is not clear in this instance, since the canonists differ ; therefore, for practical purposes, it is at least probable that the action is valid.

The point is fully discussed by Ojetti, who favours the view that the observance of the clause is necessary for validity.¹ Boudinhon, however, has given what appears to us a much more satisfactory solution in *Jus Pontificium*, VIII, 1928, pp. 28-38, based on a careful comparison of this canon with others which apply it to individual cases. To the question whether the law requires the observance of this clause, everywhere and always, under pain of nullity of the subsequent actions, he answers in the negative. No principle of so general and sweeping a character can be established. An act is invalid only in those instances in which the law, expressly or equivalently, declares that advice is to be sought under pain of nullity ; otherwise it is not invalid. Many examples are given of both categories. For example, in the procedure for removing a parish priest to another parish, the priest sets out in writing his reasons for not wishing to move. Then Canon 2164 : "Ordinarius, si, non obstantibus allatis causis, iudicet a proposito non esse recedendum, debet, ut valide agat, super eisdem causis audire duos parachos consultores etc." Cf. also Can. 2159. On the other hand, in many other canons, not only is there no mention of consultation being essential for validity, but it is occasionally merely facultative, as in 1164 §1 and 1234 §1. We think that this solution of the difficulty given by Boudinhon is correct, and the meaning of the phrase in Canon 105 is that, when the law requires a consultation for the validity of an action, it suffices to hear what the persons have to say for the act to be valid.

¹ *Jus Pontificium*, VII, 1927, p. 13.

(ii) Except in cases where consultation is optional on a superior's part, the non-observance of the clause is always unlawful, in the common law, even though the subsequent act may be, as we have seen, entirely valid. The superior has failed in fulfilling his obligations, as human beings are often wont to do, and it is open to him to repent and amend his ways. But it is necessary to remember that, in many places, there exist lawful customs which are contrary to the common law, and the law requiring consultation is subject, like any other, to Canons 25-30 and especially to Canon 5.

E.J.M.

DIVISION OF A PARISH

Is the division of a *paroecia amovibilis* valid if made without a canonical cause? (X.Y.Z.)

REPLY

It is suggested by our correspondent that a canonical cause is always required for dividing a *paroecia inamovibilis*, and that doubt or uncertainty arises only in the case of *paroecia amovibilis*. We can find no basis for this distinction as regards the division of a parish; the difference between the two kinds of parishes has reference not to the immunity of the territory, but to the legal process in removing a parish priest. Hence, Canon 1427 §1: "Possunt etiam Ordinarii ex iusta et canonica causa paroecias *quaslibet*, invitiss quoque earum rectoribus et sine populi consensu, dividere . . ." All parishes are subject to division, even those in charge of religious, provided canonical reasons exist.

The canonical causes given in §2 of the same canon are: "Si aut magna sit difficultas accedendi ad ecclesiam paroecialem, aut nimia sit paroecianorum multitudo, quorum bono spirituali subvenirinequeat ad normam Can. 476§1." From Can. 1428 the division of a parish without canonical cause is invalid. The commentators discuss the meaning of "difficultas" and "nequeat",¹ but the question is scarcely capable of absolute definition, since it will depend on local

¹ Cf. *l'Ami du Clergé*, 1930, p. 193.

conditions. The decision as to the existence of a canonical cause rests, of course, with the Ordinary, against whom an appeal to the Holy See may be made *in devolutivo* (Can. 1428 §3).

E.J.M.

KALENDAR FOR CERTAIN RELIGIOUS

In the parish church served by a non-exempt religious Institute, the fathers follow the universal Ordo for the Office. Are they obliged to follow the diocesan Ordo for the Mass or may they use the universal Ordo for both Mass & Office? (C.H.)

REPLY

The universal kalendar, which appears annually, determines the dates on which the feasts of the Easter cycle and other variable days occur. In addition to the feasts therein, each particular church requires a slightly modified kalendar providing for the observance of such feasts as that of the titular or of the dedication of the church.

But the liturgical law supposes that, in addition to this slight modification, there exists everywhere a kalendar which is either "proprium dioeceseos" or "proprium ordinis". Privileges used to be conceded to certain dioceses and religious institutes permitting them to follow the kalendar proper to the secular clergy of Rome, e.g. *Decreta Authentica* n.n. 3694 ad 1 and 4236. These privileges were abolished, 28 October, 1913, n. 4308 ad IV, c: "Privilegia quibus nonnullae Dioeceses vel Instituta gaudent, sese scilicet conformandi Kalendario Cleri Romani, aut alicuius Ordinis seu Congregationis et alia huiusmodi, penitus abolentur." It may well be that, in spite of this general abolition, certain institutes enjoy some particular privilege or indult which permits them to depart from the common law on the subject; in which case they follow the directions contained in their indults.

If they enjoy no particular privilege, the rule to be followed is clearly stated in n. 4312, 28 February, 1914:

I. Ordines Regulares proprium omnino habere debent Kalendarium, quod pariter adhibendum est a Monialibus et Sororibus eorundem Ordinum.

II. Congregationes seu Instituta utriusque sexus a S.Sede approbata et sub regimine unius praesidis generalis constituta, si ad recitationem divini Officii teneantur, proprium pariter habeant Kalendarium.

III. Congregationes et Instituta, quae sive Ordinaria sive Apostolica auctoritate sint approbata, non tamen comprehendantur paragrapho praecedenti, uti debent Kalendario dioecesano prouti iacet, additis iuxta Rubricas Officiis quae ipsis peculiariter concessa sunt.

It would appear that the religious referred to by our correspondent come under n. III of this decree, and should follow the diocesan kalendar for both Mass and Office.

E.J.M.

DUPLICATING

According to the Instruction (S.R.C. 11 March, 1858) printed in the *Rituale Romanum*, when a priest binates, he must, after the last gospel of the first Mass, look to see if there be any remains of the Precious Blood ; if so, he must carefully receive them. "Quod nullimode omittendum est." The Ritual applies this to the case where both Masses are said in the same church as well as to that when they are said in different churches. But it is the practice in some places to do this, not after the last gospel, but before covering the chalice after the prayer "Corpus tuum, Domine . . ." if there have been a number of communions. This practice does not seem to conform to the Instruction, though it may equally well achieve the desired end. Is it therefore allowable ? (W.)

REPLY

(i) S.R.C. 11 March, 1858 has long been the chief text which the writers have followed in explaining the rites to be observed when a priest duplicates, and it has an added authority from its inclusion in the 1925 *editio typica* of the *Rituale Romanum*, though it is not included in new editions

of the Missal. The last two paragraphs as printed in the Ritual are not part of the decree printed in *Decreta Authentica* n. 3068 and *Fontes C.I.C.* VIII n. 5989.

The recent authors we have consulted appear not to have noticed this addition, and quoting the decree in its original form, they restrict the direction concerning what is to be done after the last gospel to the case where the second Mass is being said in a different church. Thus, Crogaert, *Caeremoniale*, 1935, p. 286; Aertnys, *Compendium Liturgiae Sacrae*, 1936, p. 49; *Collationes Tornacenses*, 1937, p. 34. Directions for occasions when the second Mass is in the same church are found in the Missal, after the first Mass of Christmas, after the first Mass on All Souls Day, and in various decrees S.R.C.

The two added paragraphs found in the current Ritual, preceded by a red sign, make more precise the directions found in earlier sources. The decree begins: "Quando Sacerdos eadem die duas Missas dissitis in locis celebrare debet . . ." The added portion begins: "Quando vero sacerdos eadem die duas Missas in eadem ecclesia offerre debet, se gerat uti supra dictum est . . ." The conclusion, noted by our correspondent, undoubtedly must be that the action of consuming, after the last Gospel, whatever remnants of the sacred species remain in the chalice, applies indifferently to all cases of bination. This is supported by the words: "Quod nullimode omittendum est, quia Sacrificium moraliter durat, et superexstantibus adhuc vinis speciebus, ex divino praecepto compleri debet", a principle which has equal force whether the second Mass is at a later time in a different place, or whether it follows immediately and at the same altar, as often happens on Christmas Day and All Souls Day.

This appears to us a correct and valid deduction, though it is not drawn by any of the authors we have consulted. We should be grateful for the comments of any readers who detect some flaw in it, for one does not willingly depart from the common teaching and practice in these matters.

(ii) The original decree preceded the introduction of the Leonine vernacular prayers after Mass. It has been maintained that, since the action under discussion takes place after the priest has completed the Mass, it should be

done no
we thin
observe
people.
at this t
should n
and the
observe

The
III, 6)
in quali
Doe
reason
(III, 5
"orator

We
in this
In the
Requie
or bur
oratori
contrar
that th
relying
be rest
of "ec
rubric
De Ru
Liturgi
Brehm

done nowadays after the Leonine prayers. This view may, we think, be followed.¹ But it seems to us incorrect to observe the rubric immediately after the communion of the people. It is true that the purpose is effected quite as well at this time, but the action, though necessary as a precaution, should not be introduced without authority within the Mass, and the direction of the decree should always be literally observed: "completo ultimo Evangelio".

E. J. M.

REQUIEM MASSES

The Rubric "De Missis Defunctorum" (Addit. et Varia. III, 6) says: "In die III, VII, XXX et anniversaria . . . in qualibet Ecclesia . . ." etc.

Does this phrase include semi-public oratories? The reason for questioning this is that in the previous section (III, 5) a distinction is made between "ecclesia" and "oratoria semipublica". (W.)

REPLY

We think that the meaning of "in qualibet Ecclesia" in this rubric is to include oratories and semi-public oratories. In the previous n. 5, dealing with the faculty of saying a Requiem Mass in various edifices on the occasion of decease or burial, different rules are made for churches and for oratories public, semi-public and private. In n. 6, on the contrary, the rule is for every church, and therefore implies that there is no distinction between them. Certainly, by relying on the strict meaning of words, n. 6 would have to be restricted to buildings which come within the definition of "ecclesia", but there is ample authority amongst the rubricians for interpreting it in the wider sense. Crogaert, *De Rubricis Missalis*, 1935, p. 222, quoting *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, 1922, p. 380; *l'Ami du Clergé*, 1925, p. 734, quoting Brehm, *Synopsis Additionum* etc., p. 199.

E. J. M.

¹ Cf. *Ami du Clergé*, 1928, p. 767.

MISSIONARY QUASI-PAROCHUS

Has the administrator of a pro-Cathedral, in a missionary vicariate where all are quasi-parishes, the same canonical status as a quasi-parochus? (Subscriber.)

REPLY

Canon 451 §2: Parochis aequiparantur cum omnibus iuribus et obligationibus paroecialibus et parochorum nomine in iure veniunt:

(1) Quasi-parochi, qui quasi-paroecias regunt de quibus in Canon 216 §3.

(2) Vicarii paroeciales, si plena potestate paroeciales sint praediti.

Canon 478 §1: Sicut parochus ecclesiae cathedralis, ita vicarius paroecialis cathedralis praecedit omnibus alii dioecesis parochis aut vicariis . . .

The full observance of the canon law on parishes cannot be observed in missionary districts, and in some places the missionaries function as delegates of the Ordinary. The Church however desires, wherever possible, that missionary districts should be divided into parishes after the pattern of parishes elsewhere, with church, parishioners and rector assigned. They are styled *quasi-paroeciae*, and with the exceptions mentioned by the law, their rectors are equivalent to parish priests. Cf. Canon 216 and S.C.P.F. 25 July 1920; *Sylloge*, n. 82.

Canon 471 seq., in determining the status of *vicarii paroeciales*, a term which includes, for example, those in charge of vacant parishes, legislates for the whole church. The most dignified of these is the priest whom we are accustomed to call in England the *administrator* of the Cathedral.

We think it is quite certain that, in missionary districts which are divided into *quasi parishes*, the administrator of the pro-Cathedral has not only the same rights and obligations as the *quasi-parochi* but enjoys precedence over them all on an analogy with Canon 478 §1. We cannot find the point explained even by those canonists, such as Vromant who deal expressly with missions.

E. J. M.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

(i) SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM

CANONIZATIONIS BEATAE GEMMAE GALGANI, VIRGINIS

SUPER DUBIO

An, stante duorum miraculorum approbatione post indultam eidem Beatae ab Apostolica Sede venerationem, TUTO procedi possit ad sollemnem ipsius Canonizationem. (A.A.S. xxxi, 1939, p. 352).

Quod Apostolus magnificis hisce verbis de se est professus : *Christo confixus sum cruci, vivo autem, iam non ego, vivit vero in me Christus* (Gal., 2, 19, 20), beata Gemma Galgani mente, moribus totaque vita tenuit.

Ipsa enim dilecti Sponsi amorem atque passionem iugiter recolendo, meditando, contemplando, eo usque pervenit, ut cruci eius confixa iam non ipsa viveret, viveret vero ipse Christus in ea : qui heroicam quidem sed ab hominum oculis absconditam, sponsae suae caritatem patiendique studium miris donis, dum vitam agebat, post eius autem mortem, miraculorum gloria eam cumulando, magnifice ac munifice rependit.

"Camigliano" in oppido prope Lucam die 12 Martii a. D. 1878 Gemma orta est ex Henrico Galgani, de S. Ioannis Leonardi genere, et Aurelia Landi, honestis coniugibus. Octavum agens annum, matre demortua, Servae Dei Helenae Guerra, Instituti Oblatarum S. Spiritus, vulgo Sororum S. Zitae, Fundatrici, instituenda credita fuit, sub cuius sapienti magisterio miras in Dei amore progressiones fecit, a quibus ad vitae terminum usque numquam restitit. Multas tribulationes, angustias, corporis infirmitates, maerores, patris excessum, suorum bonorum direptionem durissimamque egestatem forti animo, Dei confisa, pertulit.

Sacris Virginibus a Passione Domini adiungi peroptaverat, sed a pluribus difficultatibus, ne sanctum hoc votum expleret, fuit praepedita. Ab omnibus derelicta, humaniter a piissima familia Giannini fuit excepta, in cuius sinu Sabbato Sancto a. 1903, divini amoris igne exaestuans, diro morbo consumpta, purissimam animam, a corporeis laqueis solutam, suo caelesti Sponso reddidit, annos nata fere vigintiquinque.

Sanctitatis fama, quae intra domesticos parietes, veluti

sub modio abscondita, ea vivente, cives latebat, ea vi demortua, potenter erupit. Quare vix septem intercesserunt anni, quum ordinaria auctoritate super scriptis, super sanctitatis fama atque cultu numquam exhibito confecti sunt processus. Servato iuris ordine Benedictus XV fel. rec. die 28 Aprilis a. 1920 sua manu Introductionis causae Commissionem obsignavit. Apostolicis inquisitionibus rite absolutis, die 29 Novembris a. 1931 heroicas Servam Dei virtutes exercuisse, die autem 5 Februarii a. 1933 miracula a Deo, eius interventione, fuisse patrata decretum est : sollemnia demum Beatificationis die 14 Maii mensis anni eiusdem in Vaticana Basilica celebrata fuere. Eodem hoc die mira sanatio contigit, unde paullo post Canonizationis causa est resumpta. Alia mira sanatio duos post annos evenit, quae, sicut et prior, uti prodigium die 26 Martii anni 1939, Santissimo D. N. approbante, habita est.

Ut autem iuridice constaret Sacram Rituum Congregationem munus sibi a iure commissum rite complevisse, dubium erat disceptandum : *An, stante approbatione duorum miraculorum post indultam eidem Beatae ab Apostolica Sede veneratione, TUTO procedi possit ad sollemnem ipsius Canonizationem.* Quapropter die 2 Maii anni huius in generalibus S. C. comitiis coram Ssmo D. N. Pio Papa XII, Rmno Cardinalis Ianuarius Granito Pignatelli di Belmonte, Episcopus Ostien. et Albanen., Causae Relator, dubium hoc proposuit, cui omnes tum Rmni Cardinales, tum Officiales Praelati Patresque Consultores unanimi affirmativo suffragio responderunt. Beatissimus vero Pater actorum sacrae Congregationis approbationis sententiam edere distulit, et fine ut Suis praesentiumque precibus Deum exoraret ut Eius beneplacitum Sibi innotesceret.

Diem autem hanc elegit, Dominicam octavam post Pentecostem, 23 Iulii mensis, ut decretum hoc ederetur. Quare accitis Rmns Cardinalibus Carolo Salotti, S. R. C. Praefecto et Ianuario Granito Pignatelli di Belmonte, Causae Ponente seu Relatore una cum R. P. Salvatore Natucci Fidei Promotore generali meque infrascripto Secretario, Sacroque religiose litato, edixit : *TUTO procedi posse ad sollemnem B. Gemmae Galgani, Virginis, Canonizationem.*

Datum Romae, die 23 Iulii a. D. 1939.

C. Card. SALOTTI, Praefectus

(ii) ALLOCUTIO

Quam Beatissimus Pater habuit, die 30 mensis Septembris anno 1939, adstantibus Eŕmo P. D. Augusto Presb. Cardinale Hlond, Archiepiscopo Gnesnense et Posnaniense aliisque e Polonia christifidelibus. (A.A.S. xxxi, 1939, p. 393).

Très chers Fils et Filles,

Vous êtes venus ici implorer Notre Bénédiction, en un moment particulièrement douloureux pour votre Patrie, à une heure tragique de votre vie nationale. Aussi avons-Nous bien rarement senti en Nous intime et ardent autant qu'aujourd'hui, le désir de Nous montrer en fait et en paroles ce que, par un choix mystérieux de la Providence, Nous sommes appelé à être ici-bas : le Vicaire et le représentant de Jésus-Christ, l'image vivante de ce Dieu incarné, dont S. Paul a pu dire : "Apparuit benignitas et humanitas" (Tit. III, 4). Oui, c'est la compassion infiniment tendre du Cœur divin lui-même que Nous voudrions en ce moment vous faire voir, entendre, sentir, à vous tous, enfants de la Pologne catholique.

Vous êtes venus sous la conduite de votre vénéré Cardinal-Primat et accompagnés de plusieurs de vos prêtres, comme pour témoigner que votre attachement traditionnel à vos pasteurs, gage de votre dévouement au Pasteur suprême, n'a rien perdu sous le coup des adversités qui vous frappent, et ne se laissera pas ébranler par celles qui vous menaceraient encore.

Vous êtes venus, non pour formuler des revendications, ni pour exhaler des lamentations bruyantes ; mais pour demander à Notre cœur, à Nos lèvres, une parole de consolation et de réconfort dans la souffrance. Notre devoir de père est de vous la donner ; et personne assurément n'aurait le droit de s'en étonner. L'amour d'un père s'intéresse à tout ce qui touche ses enfants ; combien plus s'émeut-il de ce qui les blesse ! A chacun d'eux il voudrait redire le mot de S. Paul aux Corinthiens : "Qui de vous peut souffrir sans que je souffre avec lui ?" *Quis infirmatur, et ego non infirmor ?* (II Cor. xi, 29).

Or, il y a des milliers déjà, des centaines de milliers de pauvres êtres humains qui souffrent, victimes atteintes dans leur chair ou dans leur âme par cette guerre, dont tous Nos

efforts, vous le savez, ont si obstinément, si ardemment —mais si vainement, hélas !—tâché de préserver l'Europe et le monde. Devant Nos yeux passe maintenant, vision d'effroyable affolée ou de morne désespoir, la multitude de fugitifs et des errants, tous ceux qui n'ont plus de patrie, plus de foyer. Jusqu'à Nous montent déchirants les sanglots des mères et des épouses, pleurant les êtres chers qui sont tombés sur le champ de bataille ; Nous entendons la plainte désolée de tant de vieillards et d'infirmes, qui restent trop souvent sans doute privés de toute assistance, de tout secours ; les vagissements et les pleurs des tout-petits, qui n'ont plus de parents ; les cris des blessés et le râle des moribonds, qui n'étaient pas tous des combattants. Nous faisons Nôtres toutes leurs souffrances, toutes leurs misères, tous leurs deuils. Car l'amour du Pape envers les enfants de Dieu ne connaît pas de limites, pas plus qu'il ne connaît de frontières. Tous les fils de l'Eglise sont chez eux, quand ils se pressent autour de leur Père commun ; tous ont une place dans son cœur.

Mais cette tendresse paternelle, qui fait une part de choix aux affligés, qui voudrait s'arrêter sur chacun d'eux —et dont vous pouvez recueillir aujourd'hui l'immédiat témoignage,—n'est pas l'unique bien qui vous reste. Aux yeux de Dieu, aux yeux de son Vicaire, aux yeux de tous les hommes de bonne foi, il vous reste d'autres richesses ; de celles qui ne se gardent pas dans des coffres de fer ou d'acier, mais dans les cœurs et dans les âmes.—Il vous reste d'abord le rayonnement d'une bravoure militaire, qui a rempli d'admiration vos adversaires eux-mêmes, et à laquelle loyalement ils ont rendu hommage.

Il vous reste, nuée lumineuse dans l'actuelle nuit, tous les grands souvenirs de votre histoire nationale, dont dix siècles bientôt révolus ont été consacrés au service du Christ et maintes fois à la magnanime défense de l'Europe chrétienne. Il vous reste surtout une Foi qui ne veut pas se démentir, digne aujourd'hui de ce qu'elle fut jadis, de ce qu'elle était hier encore. Sur les chemins tour à tour tragiques et glorieux, qu'a suivis la Pologne, il a coulé déjà bien des fleuves de larmes et des torrents de sang ; il y a eu des abîmes de douleur ; mais il y a eu aussi des cimes ensoleillées de victoire, des plaines et des vallées pacifiques

illumination
littérature
à com
appare
résurre
histoire
verra
Jésus-
Le
deux S
Bobola
temps
n'a pe
envers
"de la
siècles
des d
indest
C'
Filles,
âmes
Dieu,
de la
même
par le
vie ca
vous ;
les m
mage
camp
specta
charit
jouiro
Nous
pours
cham
Quell
s'emp
est de
rageu
confia
Vol

illuminées de toutes les splendeurs de la religion, de la littérature et des arts. Dans sa vie mouvementée, ce peuple a connu des heures d'agonie et des périodes de mort apparente ; mais il a vu aussi des jours de relèvement et de résurrection. Il y a une chose qu'on n'a pas vue dans votre histoire ; et votre présence ici Nous assure qu'on ne la verra jamais : c'est une Pologne infidèle ou séparée de Jésus-Christ et de son Eglise.

Le pays de St. Casimir et de Ste Hedwige, le pays des deux Saints Stanislas, de St. Jean de Kenty et de St. André Bobola a pu perdre, au cours des âges, plus ou moins longtemps son territoire, ses biens, son indépendance ; jamais il n'a perdu sa Foi. Jamais il n'a perdu sa tendre dévotion envers la Vierge Marie, cette "Reine" puissante et douce "de la Pologne", dont l'image miraculeuse est depuis des siècles, dans le sanctuaire de Czestochowa, la consolatrice des douleurs de toute une nation et la confidente de ses indestructibles espérances.

C'est pourquoi Nous sommes assuré, très chers Fils et Filles, que des sentiments si solidement ancrés dans vos âmes ne faibliront pas. Nous voulons d'ailleurs espérer que Dieu, dans sa miséricorde, ne permettra pas que l'exercice de la religion soit entravé dans votre pays ; Nous voulons même espérer, malgré bien des raisons de craindre, inspirées par les desseins trop connus des ennemis de Dieu, que la vie catholique pourra continuer profonde et féconde parmi vous ; que vous pourrez renouveler les cérémonies du culte, les manifestations de piété envers l'Eucharistie et d'hommage à la Royauté du Christ, dont vos villes et vos campagnes donnaient récemment encore le magnifique spectacle ; que la presse catholique, les institutions charitables, les œuvres sociales, l'enseignement religieux, jouiront de la liberté qui leur est due. C'est pourquoi Nous exhortons spécialement vos pasteurs spirituels à poursuivre, à accroître encore, leurs initiatives dans le champ qui, Dieu aidant, pourra rester ouvert à leur zèle. Quelles que soient les circonstances nouvelles où ce zèle s'emploiera, le premier devoir de tous, pasteurs et brebis, est de persévérer non seulement dans la prière, mais courageusement aussi dans les œuvres, avec une inébranlable confiance.

Car c'est précisément aux heures où la Providence divine semble, pour un temps, se cacher, qu'il est beau, et méritoire, et bon, de croire en elle ! Dans les malheurs qui vous atteignent, dans ceux qui peut-être encore surviendraient, vous ne cesserez donc jamais de voir cette Providence qui ordonne tout à ses fins, qui "ne se trompe jamais dans ses conseils" (*Deus cuius providentia in sui dispositione non fallitur.*—Orat. Lit. Missae, Dom. VII p. Pent.),—et qui, lorsqu'elle laisse peser sur ses enfants une lourde croix, n'a en vue que de les faire plus semblables à leur Sauveur bien-aimé, de les associer plus intimement à son œuvre rédemptrice, et par conséquent de les rendre plus chers à son Cœur.—Comme ces fleurs de vos pays, qui sous l'épaisse couche des neiges hivernales attendent les souffles tièdes du printemps, vous saurez attendre, dans une prière confiante, l'heure des consolations célestes.

Votre douleur, ainsi tempérée d'espérance, ne sera donc point mêlée de rancune, moins encore de haine. Que votre élan vers la justice reste conforme, car il peut et doit l'être, aux divines lois de la charité. C'est par la justice et la charité, en effet,—et par elles seules, comme Nous ne cessons pas de le redire,—que pourra être enfin rendue au monde, aujourd'hui convulsé, cette paix que, parmi le tumulte des armes, appelle si anxieusement la clameur des peuples, et pour laquelle, d'un bout du monde à l'autre, des millions d'âmes sincères, même de celles qui ne professent pas la Foi catholique, élèvent leurs prières vers Dieu, seul Maître souverain des hommes et des choses.

Nous ne vous disons pas : "Séchez vos larmes" ! Le Christ, qui a pleuré sur la mort de Lazare et sur la ruine de sa patrie, recueille, pour les récompenser un jour, les larmes que vous répandez sur vos chers morts, et sur cette Pologne, qui ne veut pas mourir. Pour le chrétien, qui sait le prix surnaturel de ces perles, les larmes elles-mêmes peuvent donc avoir leur douceur. Et n'y a-t-il pas d'ailleurs, en chacun de vous, un peu de l'âme de votre immortel Chopin, dont la musique a réalisé ce prodige, de faire de la joie profonde et intarissable avec nos pauvres larmes humaines ? Si l'art d'un homme a pu aller jusque-là, où n'iront-elles pas, dans l'art de bercer nos douleurs intimes, la sagesse et la bonté de Dieu ?

Comm
pour vous
effusion
attendons
polonaise.
chacun d
souvenirs.

Comme gage des faveurs célestes, que Nous implorons pour vous, très chers Fils et Filles, Nous vous donnons avec effusion de cœur Notre Bénédiction Apostolique. Nous étendons cette Bénédiction à tous les enfants de la nation polonaise, et plus particulièrement aux personnes que chacun de vous a présentes dans ses intentions ou ses souvenirs.

CHURCH MANAGEMENT

NOTICE BOARDS

THE large exterior notice board of architectural character is still young as an article of Catholic usage.

Our emancipated forefathers were slow to shake off the inclination to hide themselves, and saw no need for advertisement. The resplendent notice boards of their Anglican neighbours probably gave to the clergy of a generation or so ago the idea of similarly making known to the world the times of their services. Notice boards for exterior use are of two kinds ; those which are attached to the wall, and those usually much bigger and more pretentious, which stand free supported by posts. The second type is naturally more suitable to a church which has plenty of ground in front where it can be displayed to full advantage. Whichever kind is preferred the wood from which it is constructed must be well-seasoned and durable. Teak and oak are the best and if stained and polished will take the lettering without any further preparation. Other woods require to be painted with good oil paint put on over a coat of priming. Gold-leaf is by far the best medium to use for the inscriptions. Painted lettering on a church notice board looks cheap and mean and soon becomes shabby, whereas gold always looks dignified and will outlast many paintings so that in the long run it is the less expensive. A moulding along the top, shaped either as a cornice or as a gable according to the style, and one around the edges, give a neat finish and serve the practical purpose as a protection against rain. A board which stands free must be firmly fixed. The posts should be stout and strong, and, before erecting, the parts which are to be buried should be treated with a reliable preservative. Solignum, for example, against decay. Posts which are securely embedded in concrete are the better able to stand up against storms and knocks.

As to what should be written upon the board, this is largely a matter of choice, but to begin one cannot do better than blazon the papal device of tiara and cross keys conspicuously at the top. The choice depends upon whether one regards the board as a constant reminder to one's own

parishion
hood, or
newcomer
former r
service,
parochia
be conte
offices.

Which
tainty th
it be o
Anyone
surprise
a day w
church.
a creepy
disappoi
of the in

This
bigotry
interest
Church
address
nothing
Howeve
acts as a
The
municip
well to
to prev
else tha

parishioners and an advertisement to the whole neighbourhood, or simply as a discreet guide for the convenience of newcomers and occasional visitors. Those who favour the former notion will fill out the board with notices of every service, every guild and confraternity, and every other parochial activity : those who incline towards the latter will be content with a simple statement of the hours of sacred offices.

Whichever line one may take, it can be said with certainty that these notice boards do fulfil a practical purpose if it be only that they attract the attention of strangers. Anyone who would take the trouble to watch would be surprised at the number of passers-by who in the course of a day will stop and scrutinize the notices outside a Catholic church. With eager eye they will scan every line, finding a creepy thrill, no doubt, at the mention of confession, and disappointed at the absence of any reference to the sittings of the inquisition.

This curiosity, rooted as it is in the last survivals of bigotry and suspicion, may contain germs of genuine interest which will eventually grow into fruitfulness. In the Church of England it is customary to insert the name and address of the incumbent below the notices. There is nothing to prevent us from doing likewise if we wish. However, the practice is one of doubtful advantage, for it acts as a bait to undesirable callers.

The town bill-poster claims the right to affix his dreary municipal notices to the notice boards of churches. It is as well to have a separate board for his own peculiar use, thus to prevent him from defacing walls and doors or anything else that he may deem convenient.

J. P. R.

BOOK REVIEWS

An Outline of Church History—Part IV. Edited by the Rev. Edward Shillito. Crown 8vo. Pp. 138. (George Allen and Unwin, Ltd. Cloth 4s. 6d. Students' Edition 2s. 6d.)

THIS is the fourth of a series of lessons in Church History originally produced as broadcast talks, and now got into book form. The idea seems to have been to get a number of prominent historians to give a series of short, interesting, popular, even chatty, talks on a central theme, and the present volume has put together the talks dealing with "Life and Letters of the Early Church". They make twelve short chapters, ranging from the literature of the New Testament to arts and crafts in the first six centuries. While there is much that is agreeably stated, and might usefully serve as a guide to teachers, it must be said at once that this is not a book suitable for Catholic children or students, though the publishers have been at pains to produce a cheap Students' Edition. Two of the talks are excellent, one by Mr. Cyril Bailey on the rival religions to Christianity, the other by the Dean of Winchester on the romance of the New Testament manuscripts. But there are others which are disappointing. Professor C. H. Dodd is so undogmatic on the teaching of St. Paul as to be insipid. To sum up the Epistle to the Romans with the remark that Christianity meant to St. Paul "inner freedom of the spirit"—freedom to do the thing you know to be right", is simply an emasculation of the whole doctrine of Justification. To see in the Epistle to the Hebrews the first introduction of Platonism into Christian teaching and not to dwell on the fierce underlying problem of Judaism and Christianity, is to distort the meaning of the Epistle. But it is in his treatment of the Gospel of St. John that Professor Dodd reaches his undogmatic comprehensive best. He manages to get through his talk without bringing himself to admit that "the Word was made flesh" means quite simply that Christ was God. Instead we have a tortuous explanation that *Logos* means *meaning*, and that the Word of God is the meaning of life, which is the expression of the thought and purpose of God; and so "the divine meaning of the whole of creation, of nature and of man, is embodied in a human

life, the life of Jesus Christ". To be of much value, "potted" history like this must be trenchant and dogmatic. When it becomes vague and undecided it is merely tiresome.

A. B.

A Christian's Christmas. Edited by Lord Clonmore. Pp. xi + 244. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 7s. 6d.)

THE plan of a collection of Catholic writings, historical, theological, and devotional, on the subject of the Nativity was well conceived, and has been well executed by Lord Clonmore. His selection has been confined to works published by Burns Oates and Washbourne, and the fact that his choice of passages from English Catholic writers has not thereby been unduly hampered is a tribute to the excellent work done in recent years by that firm. Among the authors represented are R. H. Benson, G. K. Chesterton, Ronald Knox, Alice Meynell, Cardinal Newman, Cardinal Wiseman, Archbishop Goodier, Francis Thompson, Fr. Faber and Abbot Butler ; while some good hymns have been included which are to appear in the forthcoming new edition of the Westminster Hymnal. It is to be hoped that Lord Clonmore's anthology has found its way into many homes as a Christmas present.

G. D. S.

The Meaning of Lourdes. By Dom Francis Izard, O.S.B. Pp. 174. (Catholic Book Club, London. 2s. 6d.)

The Shrine of Our Lady of Walsingham. By Rev. W. Reany, S.T.D. Pp. 47. (Sands & Co., London. 1s.)

THE question of the cures at Lourdes often takes precedence, in the minds of some people, over the more important value of this famous shrine as a place of spiritual pilgrimage. Some devout Catholics accept anything as a miraculous cure, others are critical to the extent of scepticism. The value of Dom Izard's book must be placed, firstly in his qualifications as a medical witness of events, and secondly in the amount of time and study which he has devoted to the examination of reputed cures. Dom Izard, a Benedictine of Quarr Abbey, after studying at Guy's Hospital, qualified as a Member of the Royal College of Surgeons and Licentiate of the Royal College of Physicians. Whilst

by no means neglecting the spiritual influence of Lourdes, the writer is chiefly concerned with the cures which in his judgement cannot be explained on a natural or psychological basis of faith healing. There exists a considerable literature on the subject, but there must be very few books written by one who is both a religious and a qualified medical man. For this reason, Dom Izard's conclusions can be recommended to the attention of those who are sceptical rather than credulous.

Dr. Reany prefaces his account of the chief English Shrine of Our Lady by an abridged version of Archbishop Baldwin's meditation on the Hail Mary. He was Archbishop of Canterbury 1185-1190, that is to say during the century following the apparitions of Our Lady at Walsingham. A similar use of mediaeval sources is made throughout the book and the subsequent history of the shrine up to modern times is outlined.

E. J. M.

St. Clement, C.S.S.R. By John Carr, C.S.S.R. Pp. 222. (Sands & Co., London. 3s. 6d.)

Père Lacordaire. By M. V. Woodgate. Pp. 191. (Sands & Co., London. 3s. 6d.)

THE life of Clement Hofbauer is a valuable tonic, in these days when the parts of Europe in which he lived and worked are once more threatened by a collapse of the Catholic religion. A Moravian by birth, with the Slavonic paternal name of Dvorac, he would have been regarded up to a short time ago as a Czecho-Slovak. His mother was a German and the Seven Years War occupied his childhood. Life spent in so troubled and miscellaneous a *milieu* is not likely, it would seem, to produce a great saint. But the influences of his home and of a saintly mother rose superior to all material disturbances, and with untiring zeal he rekindled the faith wherever he went on the business of his great Congregation. At the close of his life, passed in comparative quiet in Vienna, he was one of the most loved figures in that city. Fr. Carr does not claim to have done any original research in writing this biography, but relies chiefly on Hofer's standard life.

There is a certain parity between St. Clement's influence

over the young students of the University of Vienna and that of Père Lacordaire over the youth of France. With the habit of St. Dominic he restored also the habit of Faith to people who had well-nigh forgotten both. Miss Woodgate similarly claims no original research in presenting this portrait. It is attractively drawn, and Lacordaire's relations with Lammenais over the ill-fated *Avenir* are described with sympathetic insight.

E. J. M.

The Psychology of Preaching and Pastoral Work. By T. H. Hughes, M.A., D.Litt., D.D. Pp. 266. (George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 8s. 6d.)

No earnest priest can see the title of this book without being moved by something more than curiosity regarding its contents. Preaching forms so large a part of our ministry that any publication dealing with the pulpit should have an interest for us ; and this volume is concerned almost exclusively with preaching. It is the work of a Free Church minister, written principally for his fellow ministers ; and in this it must be acknowledged to be an admirable production. It will probably be acceptable to all non-Catholic clergymen, but among most of the readers of this journal it will have a mixed reception, because the background of the author is so very different from that which influences a priest in the years of his training. To Dr. Hughes preaching is the supreme act of worship, an idea that shocks us who know the daily wonder of Christ's own sacrifice in the Holy Mass.

Having reviewed the principles of the New Psychology, the author applies them to the work of a minister, and in particular to preaching. Suggestion and Auto-suggestion, Sublimination, man's instinctive life, with his emotions and sentiments are dealt with, in order that the preacher may see how best to make contact with other men, and the congregation as assembled in church is itself studied as a unit, to ensure the best method of approach. Important chapters on Sermon Making, and the actual delivery of the address, complete a very well-thought-out survey of the whole question of preaching from its principles to its practice.

The words of St. Paul : "Neither doth any man take

the honour to himself", come to the mind again and again whilst one reads this book, in which the only sign of vocation to Christ's ministry would seem to be an individual and personal urge to "preach the word". In fact one gets the impression that if a man has oratorical gifts, and uses them to expound the Scriptures, he may thereby become, in the opinion of the author, an accredited teacher of the Gospel truths. Such a method of election in the choice of those who are to dispense the Mysteries of God is obviously full of dangers. It is in sharp contrast with the consummate care taken by the Church in providing her priests. She demands from them a very full knowledge of Holy Scripture and of all the teaching of Christ; the course of study prescribed for a priest is longer and much more intensive than that, for instance, of a doctor or a lawyer. The seminarian is also given some training in elocution. It is not, however, the preaching of the Word that is the chief end of a priest's education, but the dispensing of grace to the faithful by the Sacraments, and especially through the Holy Mass. In traditional Christianity the sacrificing priest is more important than the prophet.

Whilst disagreeing with much that Dr. Hughes says, we frankly admit that he has given us a work full of interest for almost any reader. Catholics will get an occasional surprise, for example in finding St. Paul bracketed with Martin Luther and John Wesley as "converted", and in seeing a verse from a well-known hymn of Father Faber's ascribed to Whittier; but such things do not touch the essence of the work. When the author is discussing sermons and preaching he is on firm ground, for he emphasizes with no lack of force the golden rules that must obtain if pulpit discourses are to be full in content and effective in delivery.

L. T. H.

Religion in the Reich. By Michael Power. Pp. viii + 240. (Longmans. 6s.)

NAZI propaganda has always pointed to the fact that Catholic churches in Germany are open and full as a proof that there is no persecution of religion under the Nazi régime. Here, according to Mr. Power, is the answer which

the authorities give to the inquirer : "If all the stories you hear about Catholic persecution are true, how is it that the churches are fuller than ever ? Even the number of priests is increasing. . . . If National-Socialism were out to kill the Church, do you think we should have allowed that ? Does that sound like persecution ?" And in some quarters this answer of the Nazis proves to be quite effective. For example, it is the opinion of Pierre Crabitès and John Earle Uhler, writing jointly in a recent number of the (American) *Catholic World*, that the persecution of the Church has ceased in Germany since 1936. "With the prospect of the present War," they write, "Hitler and his aids began letting up on the Christian Church, both Catholic and Protestant, in 1936. They apparently realized that they could not browbeat German Christians without creating a formidable phalanx of enemies all over the world. Once more the churches are open, and people freely come and go in worship." Nevertheless Pope Pius XI, when he wrote his Encyclical of *Passiontide*, 1937, thought otherwise. The late Pope speaks of "this hour" (March 1937) "in which the faith of Catholics in Germany is being tested, like real gold, in the furnace of tribulation and persecution, whether open or insidious, in which they are surrounded by the organized suppression of religious freedom under a thousand forms" ; in particular he refers to "the open war waged against the Confessional schools and the abolition of free suffrage for those who have a right to Catholic education".

Mr. Power, likewise, whose information is based largely upon personal visits to the Reich, has not been deceived by the Nazi protestations of tolerance. He rightly sees in the religious situation in Germany a conflict, not between State and Religion, but between one religion and another, between Christianity and a paganism which demands idolatrous worship of the State. On the whole, he concludes, "the Faith has benefited from the suffering it has been through", but the real danger lies in the future. "There is no doubt that hundreds of thousands of young people are being brought up in an atmosphere entirely alien to Christian doctrine. Their minds are centred upon war, to the peril of European peace" (Mr. Power wrote before the outbreak of war), "and their own salvation. How far-

reaching the effects will be, remains to be seen ; but they may well be appalling."

Mr. Power's account, both of the Catholic and of the Protestant situation in Germany, is well authenticated and the story is dramatically told. One is inclined to doubt only whether he has quite justly appreciated the difficulties which faced, and still face, the German and Austrian hierarchies. Perhaps only the perspective of history, together with a knowledge of the circumstances which none but the local ecclesiastical leaders possess, will make it possible to pass a fair judgement.

G. D. S.

FROM FOREIGN PERIODICALS

Neutrality? What do you mean "Neutrality"? By the Editor of *The Catholic World* (November 1939). The purpose of this editorial article is to persuade Americans to keep out of the war, a purpose which is very intelligible and to be admired. But it appears to have been written hastily and under the impulse of an emotion so strong that the rational argument suffers in the process, and the editorial is lacking that balance and clarity to which we are accustomed. Even the writer seems conscious of this defect when he expresses the hope, in one place, that the reader has not lost the trend of the argument.

For a Catholic the mightiest of reasons for keeping out of a war is that the war is unjust, and it is the editor's belief that the present war is unjustifiable in the light of the rules laid down by eminent Catholic moralists. We happen to have some little acquaintance with the moral theologians who discuss the conditions of a just war, and can assure readers who may be disturbed by the editor's vehemence that he is quite mistaken on this point. Moral theologians recognize causes as just which are far less weighty than the cause for which the allies are fighting. They also recognize that the right to declare war rests with the civil power, to whom obedience is due from all citizens unless the wickedness of the ruler's decision is manifest.

There are some writers who are not theologians and would not, we think, claim to be eminent, who interpret the

conditi
war is,
that of
but de
belong
advisin
should
and he
and ta
But, i
mistak
this a
applic
menac
State.
to wa
perfec
person
the Bo
"We
for us
the h

conditions for a just war in such a way that the right to wage war is, in effect, denied. The outlook is rather similar to that of a person who admits the justice of eternal punishment but denies that anyone is suffering it. The editor does not belong to this school of thought. His view seems to be, in advising his fellow countrymen, that the price of peace should be paid by yielding to the demands of the adversary, and he uses the text : "If thine adversary contend with thee and take away thy coat, let go thy cloak also unto him." But, if he will forgive us for saying so, he is again quite mistaken in supposing that in the Catholic interpretation, this and similar texts counselling us to yield to injury are applicable to the civil power in relation to hostile aggression menacing the freedom of citizens, and the existence of the State. It may be the right and the duty of the civil ruler to wage war in defence of the commonweal, whilst he is perfectly willing to turn the other cheek in matters of purely personal aggression. If inspired texts on just war are desired, the Books of Machabees supply some which are indisputable : "We will fight for our lives and our laws . . . for it is better for us to die in battle than see the evils of our nation and of the holies."

E. J. M.

CORRESPONDENCE

PURGATORY

Fr. Brosnan writes :

The doctrine of St. Thomas on Purgatory is set forth in the Appendix to the Supplement of the Summa. In Question II, article 4, it is expressly stated that, although the act of concupiscence is destroyed by death, yet the disordered "root" and the result of its disordered exercise remain in the soul. "*Quamvis veniale ex pronitate fomitis contingat, tamen culpa in mente consequitur; et ideo destructo fomite, culpa adhuc manere potest*" (ad 5).

He maintains that the "*ignis purgatorius*" remits venial sin and expiates "*culpam omnem quae cum gratia stare potest*". This act of suffering is meritorious of this remission because the sufferer is still after a manner a wayfarer: "*manet homo in statu viae aliquo modo*"; because his suffering is voluntary "*secundum quid*", endured in the state of grace; and because in this life the sufferer merited that this suffering be meritorious to him.

He states that a debt of suffering must be paid by enduring the suffering (art. 5). Suffering in itself is not a defilement, yet is related to defilement "*ex causa sua*". But what if at the moment of death the sinner make so intense and so perfect an act of contrition or of charity as to have no Purgatory and go straight to heaven? What of the debt of suffering? St. Thomas does not here discuss the question. If he did he would possibly say that the sufferings of Christ were applied so wholly as to liquidate the full debt of punishment. This may afford light on the problem of indulgences.

In Dom Ernest Graf's view the souls in Purgatory are unblemished "from the fact that their first act in their new state is a perfect act of charity by which any 'stain' of venial sin or any relic of forgiven mortal sin is completely cleansed away". He says nothing about the efficiency of purgatorial punishment in this act. Yet, although the soul in Purgatory is "perfectly holy, without stain or blemish", it must still undergo sufferings because of "the penalties enacted by divine justice for pardoned sins". If divine justice exempts a soul on earth from the penalties of temporal punishment

because of a sufficiently intense and perfect act of charity or contrition, why is not a soul in Purgatory so exempt, seeing that according to Dom Ernest its act of charity is as perfect and as intense as possible? The question is confessedly difficult.

At any rate readers of the REVIEW may find it interesting to contrast and compare the view of St. Thomas with the view of Dom Ernest Graf, and of the late Abbot Vonier.

Dom Ernest Graf writes :

The passage to which Fr. Brosnan refers is, of course, taken from the early Commentaries of the Saint on the Sentences of Peter Lombard. His maturer judgement on the question is found in *De Malo* (q. VII, art. xi), where he writes : "Oportet dicere quod venialia remittuntur eis post hanc vitam etiam quantum ad culpam, eo modo quo remittuntur in hac vita ; scilicet per actum caritatis in Deum, repugnantem venialibus in hac vita commissis". He no longer holds the view that venial sin is remitted *quoad culpam* through meritorious suffering in Purgatory ; he explicitly rejects it : "Ad nonum dicendum quod remissio venialis peccati in purgatorio quantum ad poenam est ex parte purgatorii, quia homo et patiendo exsolvit quod debet, et ita cessat reatus ; sed quantum ad culpam non remittitur per poenam neque secundum quod actu sustinetur, quia non est meritoria, neque secundum quod recogitatur. Non enim esset motus caritatis quod aliquis detestaretur peccatum veniale propter poenam ; sed magis esset motus timoris servilis vel naturalis. Remittitur ergo in purgatorio veniale quantum ad culpam virtute gratiae, non solum secundum quod est in habitu, quia sic compatitur veniale peccatum, sed prout exit in actum caritatis detestantis veniale peccatum".

On the view of St. Thomas as to the moment in which this remission takes place, the sixteenth objection and the answer to it are illuminating. It had been objected that venial sin could not be forgiven in Purgatory, because no venial sin could subsist in Purgatory side by side with the vehement act of charity which every holy soul must make upon its first entry into that state. St. Thomas acutely replies : "Illa ratio non concludit quod peccatum veniale in

purgatorio non remittatur, sed quod statim ibi remittatur et hoc satis videtur probabile". Editions of the *Quaestiones Disputatae* commonly give the reading . . . "sed quod statim ibi *non* remittatur". On this point the following observation of Cardinal Lépicier is to be remarked: "Notandum vero hic est, particulam *non*, in responsione 16um, falso in textum S. Thomae irrepsisse, ut patet ex indole responsionis eiusdem, et ex hoc quod deest in pluribus codicibus mss. saeculi XIV, ut puta, Vatican., 786. f.390 recto, et 789, p. II, f.404, verso". (*De Novissimis*, ed. 1921, p. 283, note 1.)

To Fr. Brosnan's further question, why such an intense act of charity does not exempt the soul in Purgatory from all debt of temporal punishment, St. Thomas gives the answer in the body of the article quoted (*in fine*): "Quia tamen post hanc vitam non est status merendi, ille dilectionis motus in eis tollit quidem impedimentum venialis culpa; non tamen meretur absolutionem vel diminutionem poenae, sicut in hac vita".

There is thus no apparent contrast between the view of St. Thomas and the view expressed in my article, which was the opinion held also by the late Abbot Vonier, my revered master.

HOMILETICS

The Editor offers his apologies to readers of the REVIEW for the error in the Homiletic section of the December issue last year, which has resulted in the omission of sermon notes for Septuagesima and Sexagesima Sundays.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

r.
ne
u
d
e
h
39
71
c
from
the
Qu
tile
nial
one
ew
h w
ver

REVIEW
r issue
n note

E, ESS